HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME IX JULY, 1916 NUMBER 3

# DRIVER AND WELLHAUSEN

G. A. COOKE

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD

More than two years have passed since Dr. Driver died (26 Feb., 1914), the greatest Hebraist of his generation, recognized both in England and in America as a master among Old Testament scholars. The time has come when we may attempt, more calmly perhaps than was possible before, to take a survey of his work as a whole, and to consider what are his permanent contributions to Biblical science.

Early in his career he won reputation as a grammarian. The word is indeed too narrow to describe the author of *The Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (1874, revised and enlarged in 1881 and 1894); we should call him rather an interpreter of the genius and spirit of the Hebrew language. In this work, for the first time in English, appeared a treatment of Hebrew syntax which was at once philosophical in conception and ruled by the methods of scientific philology. Ewald, with a fine instinct for language, had formulated the higher grammatical laws, and Driver owed much to the work of his predecessor; but he developed it in a way which was altogether his own, with an accuracy and a wealth of illustration such as Ewald never attempted. Moreover he made a large use

Pacific Theological Seminary Berkeley, Calif.

of the comparative principle. Thirty years ago the value of comparative grammar was little understood; Driver was one of the first English scholars to apply it systematically to the explanation of Hebrew forms and usage. Thus the *Tenses* marked an epoch in the modern study of Hebrew; the student will always keep it at his side even after he has mastered its main conclusions. It is quite the most interesting book ever written on the subject, intellectually satisfying to a rare degree by its inductive method and combination of breadth with exactness in detail. It remains in many respects Driver's most original and enduring piece of work.

Along with the *Tenses* must be placed his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (1887, 2nd edn. enlarged 1913). No better discipline can be recommended to the would-be Hebraist than to put himself to school with this book. He will gain a thorough grounding in the idiom of the language, and at the same time serve a useful apprenticeship in textual criticism. For the latter branch of study it is essential to know something of the external changes which the Hebrew text has undergone, and to illustrate these Driver introduces us to the fascinating documents of Semitic epigraphy. He also works out, with copious illustrations in detail, the canons which must control the use of the Versions as witnesses to an earlier stage of the Hebrew text than the Massoretic. His chapters on these topics have done much to lift textual criticism out of the region of guesswork into a system of orderly research. In connexion with his grammatical writings we may note his contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon, which he edited in partnership with Dr. Francis Brown and the late Dr. Briggs. Driver furnished the backbone of the *corpus*, the articles on the pronouns, prepositions, adverbs, conjunctions, etc.; he put into them his strongest work; they are models of lucid and exhaustive treatment.

Herein then lay his greatness. He possessed the genius of a grammarian, a sense of values in language. No one could speak with more authority when a question of exact scholarship was involved. It would not be true to describe him an Orientalist pure and simple; he had not the range of Nöldeke, for example, among the Semitic languages; but as a Hebraist he was unsurpassed.

It is significant of his general aim that Driver laid a solid foundation of linguistic study before he took up the higher criticism. He was grammarian first, critic and commentator second. And this was the order which he always insisted upon. A great deal is written upon Old Testament criticism, the text is freely emended, and metrical schemes are applied to poetical passages, by those who betray a very imperfect acquaintance with the original language. Both by his own example and constantly in his teaching Driver aimed at securing the foundations. Accurate scholarship must be the starting-point of all else; a great deal of patient drudgery with grammar, lexicon, and concordance must go to the making of a sound interpreter of the higher sense of the sacred texts. Such is perhaps the chief moral of Driver's life-work; may it long exercise its warning influence upon English and American students!

His mental habit as a grammarian may be said to have determined his method as a critic. He proceeds cautiously on inductive lines after a close observation of facts. He sets out the critical process in detail, tabulates the distinctive features of style and usage, and, where no certain conclusion appears to be possible, he is careful to indicate the degrees of probability; with a natural leaning towards a conservative position, he prefers to suspend rather than pronounce his judgment. It is these qualities of sobriety, common-sense, and fair-mindedness which have won for his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (1891, 9th edn. 1913)

a place of its own among the books most valued by the student. We may allow that the *Introduction* has its limitations. When it first came out it was regarded in some quarters as a compromise with conservatism. Thus a distinguished Oxford colleague, Dr. Cheyne, expressed himself dissatisfied; the author did not take sufficiently high ground; "an inspiring introductory book on the Old Testament from the point of view of the critic and a progressive evangelical theologian" was declared to be the desideratum. Yet the kind of work which Driver did was exactly the work required at the time; the preliminaries had to be made sure if the forward march was to advance in the right direction. And "compromise" is not the word to apply to his attitude. He always went just as far as the facts seemed to lead him. By temperament he was more inclined to secure the position already won than to seek adventures. His caution had its roots in intellectual honesty, not in fear; hence "there is no revolt from his teaching today, nor ever will be," to quote a discerning remark made about him after his death.

The truth is that his critical work was mainly objective in character. His strength lay in dealing with the facts, and so long as we can be content with these we find him extraordinarily satisfying. For example, he spared no pains to discover accurate information on the geography, the natural history, the archæology of the Old Testament; but when we look in his commentaries for inspiration or for vision we are apt to be disappointed. The latest theory, from which we hoped so much, is faithfully dealt with, and his verdict often acts like a douche of cold water to ardent spirits. He brings us back to the facts; no one knew better how to call a hypothesis by its right name. Yet it must not be imagined that he was incapable of appreciating the higher values. Those who have read his *Isaiah* (1888, 2nd edn.

1893), or the third sermon in *Ideals of the Prophets* (1915), are not likely to forget his description of the crisis in Jerusalem in 701 B.C., and of the part which Isaiah played; the description is none the less effective because it is conveyed in his restrained, undecorated style.

One of the aims which he kept constantly before him was to popularize the results of the new learning. He had no popular gifts himself, but he did his best to make known through the pulpit and the newspapers the teaching which he gave in his lecture-room and writings. Accordingly he never hesitated to engage in controversies, not from any love of disputation, but because he felt it to be his duty to defend the religious public from misleading views, and to encourage a sane understanding of the Bible. Moreover, as we survey his work as a whole, we cannot fail to be impressed by the convictions which lay behind it; they were never obtruded, but they colored all he did. He lived through a period of transition; and it has been mainly through his influence that the transition has taken place, with its inevitable changes indeed, but with a deeper insight into the religious significance and permanent worth of the Old Testament. There was a time when historical criticism seemed to threaten the strongholds of religion; Dr. Driver proved that, on the contrary, it is the trusty ally, the *angelus interpres*, of those who regard the Bible as the record of a divine revelation. We can hardly overestimate his services to the Church in England and America. "He taught the faithful criticism and the critics faith," wrote an eminent Jewish scholar.

Dr. Driver's active career filled the interval from 1871 to 1914. Almost exactly the same period is covered by the published work of Julius Wellhausen: his first book appeared in 1870; he celebrated his 70th birthday in May, 1914, and is now, we believe, enjoying a well-earned respite from the duties of his professorship. We

are conscious of a change of atmosphere when we turn from the English to the German scholar, whose influence upon the reinterpretation of the Bible has been equally far-reaching and even more creative. In the eighties and nineties he was widely read in England and America, and many younger men from both countries have attended his lectures at Marburg and Göttingen, and cherish a grateful recollection of his genial friendliness and of the stimulus that he gave to their studies. In Old Testament criticism his great achievement has been to establish, on lines laid down by Graf, the order and date of the documents which compose the Hexateuch, with all the reconstruction which this involves in our estimate of the history and religion of Israel. The classical exposition of his theory was given in *Die Composition des Hexateuchs* (1876, 1885, 2nd edn. 1889, 3rd edn. 1899), and in his historical treatises: *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. I, 1878, later expanded under the title *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 1883, 6th edn. 1905; the article "Israel" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, edn. IX, 1881; *Israelitische u. jüdische Geschichte*, 1894, 7th edn. 1914. The *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. I, when it first appeared, made a profound impression throughout Europe. Its main thesis that "the Mosaic history is the starting-point not for the history of Israel, but for the history of Judaism" was maintained by such powerful arguments that most of the leading scholars on the continent declared themselves convinced. The general movement of investigation had been converging in this direction. Wellhausen's position had been reached independently by Vatke, Reuss, Lagarde, Graf, Kuenen. The ascendancy of the last-named scholar was rising, especially in academic circles; but Wellhausen possessed the art of reaching a wider public. In Pfleiderer's words, "he removed Old Testament criticism from the rank of a subordinate question to the centre of theological discussion." He was fortu-

nate in securing a first-rate English translation of the *Prolegomena* by Drs. J. S. Black and A. Menzies, with a preface by Robertson Smith (1885), which thus carried into England and America the impression produced in Europe. It is a brilliant piece of constructive work, full of vivacity and human interest, and remarkable for its sureness of touch and for the directness with which it goes straight to the point; here and there, we must admit, it strikes English readers as wanting in reverence. The key to the providential course of Israel's history had been discovered, and in Wellhausen's hands it was used with masterful effect to open the treasury and let in the light for all to see. This achievement has stood the test of time and of repeated and searching examination. In details it has been modified to some extent; but in its main positions Wellhausen's theory has proved unassailable, and nearly all modern scholars start from it, the latest notable convert being Rudolf Kittel in his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 2nd edn. 1909–1912.

In England Dr. Driver did not at once declare his adhesion to the new school. With habitual caution he worked over the field for himself and slowly matured his judgment. He published in 1882 an elaborate article in the *Journal of Philology* on "Some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist." It was a close criticism of Giesebrecht's contention that the language of the Priestly Code has much in common with that of the post-exilic writers. Driver did not attempt to determine the date of P; at the same time he conveyed the idea that, while accepting the critical analysis of the Hexateuch, he was not convinced by the Graf-Wellhausen theory. Yet he was steadily advancing towards it, as appeared from some critical notes on the Pentateuch, published in 1887 by Scribner's Sons, New York. In the summer term of 1889 he gave a course of lectures in Oxford on "the structure and origin of the Historical Books," and printed for the

use of his class a set of analytical tables to show the characteristics and arrangement of the various elements which compose the Hexateuch; these are all incorporated in the *Introduction* (1891). Here for the first time he made known his complete acceptance of Wellhausen's scheme, and set out in full the critical process upon which it is based. He was always attracted by Wellhausen's sanity and clear judgment. The *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* owed much to Wellhausen's early work, *Der Text der Bücher Samuels untersucht* (1871), which at once raised the standard of textual criticism, not only in the emendation of the Hebrew text but in the critical use of the Greek Versions. It was here (pages 221–224) that Wellhausen first called attention to the value of the recension which is now generally known as Lucian's.

In the constructive work of Hexateuch criticism and historical restatement we see Wellhausen at his best. With a scholarship that can always be trusted he combines the imagination and large humanity of the historian who knows how to breathe a living spirit into the dry bones of the past. He has not the prophetic outlook of Ewald, nor Driver's sense of responsibility, but he surpasses them both in the breadth and originality of his work.

Old Testament criticism, however, is not Wellhausen's only interest; we cannot fail to be impressed by the comprehensiveness of his learning. In what may be called his middle period he devoted himself mainly to Arabic studies. He has thrown much light, in his series of *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (1884–1899, six vols.; numbers 2 and 5 deal with O. T. subjects) on the history and beliefs of the heathen Arabs. He wrote the life of Mohammed for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1883. Among other works, mention may be made of his important book on the fall of the Arab kingdom, *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz*, 1902. In his third period he has returned

to a study which he took up in his earliest days, that of New Testament criticism, especially the criticism of the Gospels and Acts (*Das Evangelium Marci*, 1903; *Matthaei, Lucae*, 1904; *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1905, 2nd edn. 1911; *Johannis*, 1908). In these books he pursues fresh lines of investigation with the same independence and boldness as before, though his views have not met with the same approval. On several points, however, such as the significance of the title "Son of Man" in the Gospels, he has raised a discussion from which much has been learned.

Each of the great scholars whom we have been considering holds his distinctive place of honor, each has made his invaluable contribution to the study of the Bible; let us think of them as fellow-workers in the cause of truth. It is one of the most powerful bonds of union between men and nations. The highest interests of mankind are common interests; the *respublica litterarum* has its counterpart in the Universal Church. Divisions prevail in both; rightly regarded they do but give life and color to the unity which belongs to the inner constitution of each society. At present it is the divisions which loom largest. But we look forward to the time when, by God's mercy, the war will be over, and our fellowship in a common cause be restored, when the only strife we know will be a rivalry in great achievements and in the single-minded love of truth.

# CONFUCIANISM AND THE NEW CHINA

EDWARD T. WILLIAMS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Confucianism, with its elaborate ritual, its bloody sacrifices, its antiquated symbolism, and its fine ethical teaching, has again been made the State religion of China. Several recent mandates by the President, Yüan Shih-k'ai, have restored to it in the school, in the civil service, and in the army, the authority which previous to the revolution it had held almost uninterruptedly for two thousand years.

It is easy to misunderstand the significance of this action. It has been condemned as thoroughly reactionary, and an abridgment of the religious liberty guaranteed by the constitution of the Republic. The President in offering the sacrifices has been accused of aping the Emperor, and the re-establishment of the State religion is said to portend the return to a monarchical form of government.

The suspicions implied in these charges appear at first glance to be not unreasonable; but a more careful examination of the facts will show that the restoration of Confucianism to its old-time status has no necessary connection with any imperial aspirations that may be entertained by the President, and is not intended to abridge the constitutional rights of the adherents of other faiths, but has its origin in quite other and laudable though perhaps mistaken motives.

When the China-Japanese war of 1894 and 1895 had revealed to the Peking Government the utter weakness of the country, the inability of its three hundred and

twenty millions to cope with a nation of only one-eighth of its population, the wise men in the capital and the provinces began to seek for the source of this weakness. They discovered that the material civilization of the West, the despised learning of the "barbarians," had made Japan powerful in arms, and one Viceroy, Chang Chih-tung, had the courage in his yamen at Wuchang to write a pamphlet on the "new learning," urging the Imperial Court to accept the lesson of the war and, by mastering the sciences of the western world, acquire the ability to equip itself with the modern engines of war and the machinery for developing the resources of the country, and thus prepare to defend its heritage. In that pamphlet, however, he pointed out what he believed to be the defect of the western system of education, that is to say, its neglect of moral training. He feared that the study of the western sciences might lead to a neglect of the sacred books of Confucianism and their ethical teachings, and thus to a deterioration in morals. He warned the Government therefore against the abandonment of the national religion. His tract stirred the minds of many, but it had very little practical effect at the time.

Two years later, in 1898, the aggressive action of Germany, Russia, France, and Great Britain, each of whom had demanded and obtained from China the lease of a port, followed later by attempts to define spheres of interest in China for their respective nationals, led to a discussion of the possible partition of China. This excited intense indignation in the breasts of the Chinese people. Thereupon a patriotic society, miscalled "the Boxers," was organized. Its original aim was the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty, whose degenerate representatives in the Forbidden City were held responsible for the defenceless condition of the Empire and the consequent aggression of the western

powers. With considerable skill the Manchu rulers were able to divert these attacks upon the Government and persuade the "Boxer" leaders to direct their efforts towards the punishment of the offending foreigners. The humiliating defeat of China, the flight of the Court, and the hard terms made by the victorious allies, aroused even the most stupid and reactionary officials to a realization of the inefficiency of their government and the urgent need of reform.

It had been a common saying among the Chinese that the men of the West were very clever in their invention of machinery but that they lacked culture. The Court still affected to despise the learning of the foreigner as being of an inferior sort; but since the culture of China could not save it, two reforms were immediately projected—military reorganization, and the establishment of a public school system. With the former we are not particularly concerned. The task of arranging a course of public instruction and submitting regulations for the control of the schools was intrusted to the two foremost scholars of the Empire—Chang Chih-tung, the Viceroy mentioned above, and Chang Po-hsi, a Cabinet Minister in Peking. Previous to this undertaking there had been no public school system in China, but a system of public examinations only. Education had been left to private enterprise.

The report of the two Commissioners was made in 1904 and filled eight volumes. It provided a complete system of instruction, beginning with the kindergarten and crowned by a national university. Place was made too for special schools, such as those for teaching handicrafts and for preparing students to enter the learned professions. In the regulations submitted, the Viceroy of the Hukuang Provinces was able to embody the recommendations which he had offered and which had been rejected in 1896. The sciences of the West were

given a prominent place in the curriculum; but great stress was laid upon the need of supplementing this instruction with a thorough course in the Chinese sacred scriptures and by a regular observance of the rites of the national religion. The schools were required, therefore, to make provision for the worship by the students at stated times of the great sage, Confucius.

The report of the two Changs received the approval of the vermilion pencil; but the old system of public examinations for admission to the civil service still remained, and so long as this door to official preferment was left open, the new school system received scant recognition, for education was not made compulsory. In 1906, therefore, the old-time examinations were abolished and the new schools began to be opened everywhere.

In order to provide still more carefully against any abandonment of the literature and religion of China, the Government in 1907 issued a decree establishing at Chüfu[1]—the birthplace and burial-place of Confucius—a college for the study of the sacred books, in order that there might never be a lack of classical scholars able to interpret these books and to give ethical instruction to the young. At the same time by another decree the rank of Confucius in the pantheon was raised and the same sacrifices ordered to be made to his spirit as were offered to the Most High. This latter edict may have been suggested perhaps by the teaching of the Christian missionaries with respect to their Teacher, who was held to be one with God and was worshipped as a divine being.

A few months after the issue of these two decrees, Duke Yen, the lineal descendant of Confucius in the seventy-sixth generation, came to Peking to make

[1] Chüfu is a small town in the heart of Shantung Province, and is to be distinguished from the treaty port, Chefoo, in the same province.

acknowledgment to the Empress Dowager of his gratitude for the honor done to his ancestor, and while kneeling in audience begged Her Imperial Majesty to transform the proposed school at Chüfu, his home, into a college for the teaching of foreign languages, the sciences, international law, and political economy. The request did credit to his mind, but it was of course refused. The proposed classical school was, however, never established. This, like many other enterprises planned by the Manchus, remains to be accomplished by the Republic. The matter is under consideration now, a petition for the establishment of such a school having recently been sent to the President.

The transfer of Confucius to the first rank in the Chinese pantheon made necessary a revision of the ritual used in his worship. This work had just been done, and the temple to the sage in Peking was being improved when the revolution broke out.

The immediate effect of the revolution upon religion was not unlike that which was seen at Paris at the beginning of the French Revolution. The sacrifices to Confucius at the capital and in the provinces were neglected. The temples were abandoned. Their courts grew up in weeds, left, as one writer laments, to be gathered by the peasants for fuel. The Temple of Heaven, the most sacred enclosure in China, which had never been entered by Manchu or Chinese except by the Emperor, the nobles and highest officials with their attendants, was thrown open to the populace. Ribald inscriptions were chalked upon the walls, and the high marble altar, dedicated to the worship of the Most High God, was desecrated by the erection of booths thereon for the sale of food, cigarettes, and other articles. The Temple to the Earth was converted into a barracks, and the Field of God, which the Emperor ploughed in person and planted with grain to be offered upon the State altars,

became a show ground for acrobats and jugglers, while the hall of the Year Star was turned into a museum where the sacred vessels of the sanctuary were exhibited to the curious upon payment of an admission fee of two cents. Protests were not wanting of course, but they met with little notice at first. One of the leaders of the revolution declared that the Republic had nothing to do with religion. The Government seriously considered the proposal to convert the Temple of Heaven, which contains 737 acres, into an agricultural experiment station.

It was not the State religion alone that suffered; the Buddhist and Taoist temples also shared in the neglect and profanation. In some cities the idols were taken out and thrown into the rubbish heaps and the halls put to use as schoolrooms.

Gradually, however, the protests against the neglect and desecration of the altars grew louder and more numerous. After a year of irreligion, accompanied by considerable immorality, a reaction began to be evident. Some urged the re-establishment of Confucianism as the State religion; others advocated the adoption of Buddhism. One of the most ardent supporters of the latter proposal was a monk, known as Ming Ching, Abbot of a monastery in the southwestern part of the Tartar City of Peking. He was a brilliant scholar and joint author of a history in Chinese of the Buddhist religion in India, China, and Japan. He had studied in Japan, where he had adopted the views of the reformed Buddhists,[2] who have endeavored to adjust the teachings of Buddha to the conditions of the modern world. In

[2] In Japan known as the Shin Jodo or New Jodo, an offshoot of the Jodo, in Chinese pronounced Ching T'u, the Pure Land Sect established in China in the second century of our era and introduced into Japan in the thirteenth century. The New Jodo dates from 1262 A.D. The Pure Land Sect is the most popular of Buddhist sects in China. The reformed branch in Japan, that is to say, the New Jodo, permits the marriage of the clergy and the eating of meat, and otherwise adapts itself to modern conditions. Travellers in Japan often attend its services at the Nishi Hongwanji in Kyoto.

1906 he opened at his own expense two modern schools in Peking where the new government curriculum was taught. At the same time he endeavored unsuccessfully to organize a committee representative of all religions—Christian, Mohammedan, Taoist, Confucianist, and Buddhist—to promote friendly relations and adjust any difficulties that might arise among their various adherents. In 1912 he was influential in organizing a society for the promotion of Buddhism, which petitioned the Republican Parliament to establish that religion as the State religion. He had already lost his sight when this movement was inaugurated, and a year later, weakened by age and saddened by his blindness, he laid down his work and entered his nirvana.

The Buddhist society is still doing much to revive Buddhism in China, but the Government paid slight attention to its efforts to make that religion the official religion of the State. The Confucianists were more successful.

Lest it may be thought that the movement for the restoration of Confucianism is merely a political one, originating with those in authority and engineered by them for their own selfish purposes, it is important to emphasize the fact that the protagonist of the cause is Ch'en Huang-chang, a graduate of the University of California and a Doctor of Philosophy of Columbia University, a man who has never held office either under the Empire or the Republic. Among all who were shocked by the abandonment of the Confucian altars, no one was more earnest than he in efforts to restore the religion to its old-time status. He gathered about him a few men of like mind and organized the Confucian Association. Being a native of the province of Chekiang, he endeavored first to interest the officials and gentry of that region. Later he spent much time in Peking, where his high standing as a graduate of an

American university gave him considerable influence among the progressive young men who came to the front during the revolution. The sympathy of many in high official position was enlisted, but the movement itself was entirely non-official. By the end of 1912 Dr. Ch'en had enrolled in the Association men of every province in the Republic. Branch societies were established in the provincial capitals and in most other important cities. In 1913 the publication was begun of a monthly magazine, called *The Confucian Association Monthly*, a very creditable review of 150 pages.

The Association and its branches then began a campaign to influence the Government. Telegrams from all parts of the country poured into Peking, some addressed to the President, more of them to the two houses of Parliament, which were in session throughout the greater part of that year. The supporters of the movement were found not only among the gentry but among the merchants as well. Many of the chambers of commerce became interested and added their appeals to those of the associations. In so far as it is possible for any cause to have popular support in a country where so few are educated, the effort to make Confucianism the established religion of the Republic may be said to represent a very general desire among the people. Even the masses of the people, uneducated though they may be, are accustomed to observe in their family and social relations the ceremonies and regulations prescribed by Confucianism, and they have a jealous regard for the name and the teachings of the great sage. There is no doubt but that the Republic would be discredited in the eyes of the people if it should appear that the worship required by the old State religion was to be permanently abandoned and all the traditions of the past forgotten.

It was not difficult, therefore, to win the support of the officials for the programme of the Association. The

Governor of Chekiang was one of the first to yield to the request of so influential an organization. He is a young man of far more than ordinary ability, who came suddenly into prominence during the revolution and made himself Governor of his native province. He was quick to see that the Republic would overcome much of the passive resistance of the people against which it had to struggle, if it could appear to be no less pious than the Empire and just as ardent in its attachment to the old religion which for a hundred generations had held the affections of their forefathers. Governor Chu's telegram to the Senate and House of Representatives contains about eight hundred Chinese characters and cannot therefore be given in full in this article. His argument is that without the restraints of religion men are no better than wild beasts in their relations one with another; that no nation ever existed without a religion; that China has been especially blest by Heaven in being the birthplace of Confucius; that in the ancient scriptures edited by him are found all the principles of modern philosophy, science, law, and other branches of learning; that Sakyamuni, Jesus, and Mohammed, although unhampered, made no such record; that modern scholarship casts no doubt upon the teachings of Confucius; that Confucianism is the only national religion in China, and that its overthrow would mean the relaxation of all the social restraints and the increase of vice and crime; that truth and virtue would not be able to flourish, and, although men might talk of military and financial reform, disorders and corruption would inevitably increase, "liberty, equality, and fraternity" become impossible, and the Republic cease to exist.

He begs Parliament to behold the desecration of the sacred places, and prays it to heed the petition of the Confucian Association and restore Confucianism to its former position of authority as the State religion. He

appeals to the respect which the members of Parliament must feel for the tomb of Confucius, and declares that the restoration of his religion will mean the triumph of truth and the suppression of violence.

The great leader of the abortive attempt at reform in 1898, K'ang Yu-wei, also pleaded for the restoration of the old religion, saying that, although Christianity taught the worship of God and the love of man, it could never hope to persuade the four hundred millions of Chinese to abandon the worship of their ancestors.

One of the telegrams addressed to the President urged that the worship of Confucius in the schools be made compulsory. To this the President replied in a mandate issued on June 22d, 1913, in which he approved of the restoration of Confucianism as the State religion, but declined to acquiesce in the proposal of the telegram until he could obtain the opinions of the various provincial authorities. He took occasion, however, to point out that the monarchy, in order to bolster up its authority, had emphasized one side only of the teaching of the sage—the right of the sovereign to command and the duty of the subject to obey; whereas this relationship was subordinated by the great teacher himself to the establishment of justice, which is the most essential bond of society. He declared that this partial teaching had resulted in arbitrary government, oppression, and violence.

He noted too that this misinterpretation of the Confucian teaching had led some to doubt the fitness of that religion to become the State religion of the Republic, and that it had induced them recklessly to propose the abolition of the sacrifices. He endeavored to show that Confucius, in pointing out the disorders of past periods as recorded in the *Spring* and *Autumn Annals*, had directed attention to the wickedness of absolute rulers, and had intimated that popular government was

the original form of government. "The aromatic spirits poured out to the sage in libation," he declares, "are old, but their fragrance is none the less still pleasing to-day. Heaven's ancient gift to the world of Confucius was not meant merely for that distant age but for all times. It was a gift that foreshadowed the end of monarchical rule and the coming of a day when the virtuous and capable should have dominion through their election by the will of the people." He referred also to the extravagant notions of the radicals who had precipitated the rising of 1913, as being opposed to the will of the people. "So long as the sun and moon endure, so long as the rivers and streams continue to flow," he affirms, "so long shall the Republic preserve the sovereignty of the people; for there can never be union nor peace while the desire for liberty is unsatisfied. The rebellious seem to think that non-conformity is equality and that lack of reverence is liberty. There is but one way of preserving the State—the way of religion, morality, and economy." It was to the restoration of religion that he looked, he said, for the correction of men's hearts and the moulding of their conduct, and through this he hoped for the preservation of the Republic. A later mandate was issued making the study of the sacred books obligatory in the public schools and urging the observance of the old religion as essential to the moral training of the young.

The work of the Confucian Association culminated in the assembling of a great national convention in September, 1913, at Chüfu, Shantung, the ancient home of Confucius and the site of his tomb. This was probably the first time in history that such a convention was ever held, and its significance is increased by the fact that it was summoned not by national or provincial authority but entirely independent of the Government, by the action of private citizens interested in the preser-

vation of their ancient faith. The convention met, according to the old calendar, on the 24th day of the Eighth Moon in the 2,464th Year of Confucius, that is to say, September 24th, 1913. The 27th day of that moon is the traditional birthday of the sage. This was the high day of the festival, which lasted a week, closing on the last day of the moon. Duke Yen, of whom I have spoken above, the head of the Confucian family, attended the meetings and participated in the discussions. The autumn sacrifice to Confucius was offered in Peking that year and in many of the provincial capitals, but the President did not participate until the vernal equinox of 1914.

The return to the ancient practices of the religion has been quite gradual and is not yet entirely accomplished. Probably there never will be a complete return. A change of dynasty has often been accompanied by a modification of the ritual. In the present case the abandonment of the monarchical form of government calls for a more marked revision. The modification thus far made is announced to be a return to the simpler forms of ancient times while as yet the sceptre was not hereditary. It was not until the winter solstice of 1914 that the great service at the Altar to Heaven was resumed. This service was conducted by the President in person, and seems to have lacked somewhat the impressiveness that attended the worship by the Emperor under the old régime.

Under the Empire civil officials worshipped in the temple of Confucius; the military were required to attend in the temple of the so-called God of War. This was a deified warrior, Kuan Yu.[3] Another hero of an-

[3] Kuan Yu was a distinguished military leader in the period known as that of the Three Kingdoms, near the close of the second century of our era. He was canonized in the twelfth century, and near the close of the Ming Dynasty in the sixteenth century was raised to the rank of the gods as Kuan Ti, the title by which he is commonly known to-day.

cient times worshipped by the soldier was Yo Fei.[4] The worship of these two patron saints of the military class has recently been restored. On the 6th of March, 1915, the Ministry of War at Peking issued instructions to all commanders of troops both in Peking and in the provinces, to the effect that henceforth all officers and men in the army and in the navy must present themselves at the temple of Kuan Yu and Yo Fei to take the oath of allegiance to the President as Commander-in-chief of the Army and Navy of the Republic. This order was issued in response to a recommendation of the Governor of Chekiang. The latter, however, requested that other heroes of the past might be added to the list to be worshipped, but the Council of State objected and the President sustained the objection.

These mandates of President Yüan Shih-k'ai, restoring the State sacrifices, have met with considerable hostile criticism from those who are not Confucianists, particularly the Christians and their missionary friends. The chief objections urged are two: first that the State sacrifices were a part of the monarchical system, that the offering to Heaven in particular could only be made by the Emperor as the Son of Heaven, and that the restoration of this service, therefore, will be regarded by the people as an assumption of the Imperial dignity by Yüan Shih-k'ai; secondly, that the establishment of a State religion necessarily places the adherents of other faiths under certain disabilities, and to that extent abridges the freedom of worship guaranteed by the constitution.

To the first objection it is replied that the ancient theory of government in China was that the Emperor

[4] Yo Fei was a general during the closing years of the Sung Dynasty, and distinguished himself in service against the Kin Tartars. He was finally put to death by his Emperor at the instigation of a Minister of State who desired to make peace with the Tartars. Yo Fei has ever since been regarded as a martyr by the Chinese. He was canonized in the thirteenth century.

derived his authority from the consent of the governed, that the mandate of Heaven was given to him who was chosen by the will of the people. The ancient Classic of History says: "Heaven sees as the people see; Heaven hears as the people hear." It is held, therefore, that the Emperor worshipped the Most High as the representative of the people, and that, if an Emperor could so represent the people, a President elected by the people was much better qualified to officiate in that capacity. Hence in issuing his proclamation for the revival of the worship at the Altar to Heaven at the winter solstice of 1914, President Yüan said:

"Since the revolution, all kinds of opinions have been expressed. Some have said that the worship of Heaven originated with the monarchy and that the sacrifices ought not to be retained by the Republic. . . . As a result, the sacrifice of bullocks has been neglected and the altars made a heap of ruins. . . . 'Heaven sees as the people see; Heaven hears as the people hear.' Anything which the people ask will be granted by Heaven. Therefore in ancient times the sovereigns governed the people in the name of Heaven. Such a sentiment corresponds exactly with the spirit of republicanism. . . . The 23d of December will be the winter solstice, at which time the ceremonies attending the worship of Heaven should be observed. On that day, therefore, I, the President, will engage in this service in person at the head of the national officials of the Republic in the capacity of the representative of the people. The local authorities, as representatives of the people whom they govern, are hereby directed to offer sacrifices in their respective localities. Thus the ancient tradition will be preserved and great blessing from Heaven may be anticipated."

As to the second objection, the President has repeatedly given assurance that full religious liberty will be preserved, and it has been pointed out very forcibly by those who have urged the restoration of the State worship that a State establishment does not mean that any one is to be coerced into an observance of the State rites; that England, for instance, supports an Established Church, and that, notwithstanding this, every

man in England is permitted to worship according to his own convictions and suffers from no political disabilities.

There has been misunderstanding upon both sides with respect to this controversy. Some Christian missionaries have feared that their converts would be placed at a disadvantage in competing for official honors, and the Confucianists have thought that the Christians were unwilling for the Confucian rites to be observed at all. What the Christians have opposed is the support of the religion by the State and the offering of the sacrifices by the officials, since conceivably some Christian chosen to office would be unable conscientiously to engage in such worship. Thus the Christians would labor under disabilities. It is to be remembered, however, that Confucianism has no paid ministry or priesthood, and that the sacrifices have always been offered by the officials and paid for by the State. There exists no organization that can take over this service, so that, unless the State does make provision for it, the costly public worship must cease.

That the Government has no desire to compel anyone against his will to participate in the Confucian worship is shown by the action taken in the case of the military and naval officers who recently declined to worship at the temple of Kuan Yu and Yo Fei as commanded in the order mentioned above. The President, when informed of their unwillingness, immediately issued an order permitting those who could not conscientiously engage in such worship to take the oath of allegiance in accordance with the rites of their own religion. The Christian officers thereupon met together and drew up a ritual for observance at the Altar to the Most High in the Temple of Heaven, and there with Christian ceremonies they gave their allegiance to the President. It still remains true, however, that a Christian will be ineligible to the

Presidency so long as the offering of the Confucian sacrifices is made an obligation of that office. But to be fair to the Chinese we should not forget that, despite the religious liberty of the British, the heir to the British throne at once becomes ineligible if he finds himself unable to accept the Protestant faith. The question of Christian ineligibility to the Presidency is of course at present merely an academic one, for the Christians in China as yet constitute an insignificant part of the whole population; but their number is increasing rapidly and they already occupy in the public service positions of great influence and importance out of all proportion to their numbers.

In view of the facts recited it seems worth while to consider what there is in Confucianism that gives it such a hold upon the affections of the Chinese people, what relation the religion sustains to their moral standards, what adaptability it shows to the needs of modern life, whether or not there are any elements in it worth preserving. Confucianism profoundly influences the life of every individual in China. As a child the Chinese is taught to bow reverently to the tablet of the sage when he enters and leaves the schoolroom. The sacred scriptures edited by Confucius are the text-books given him to study, and these he learns by heart. The ritual prescribes the ceremonies to be observed when he attains his majority, the worship of Heaven and Earth and his ancestors when he is married, the solemn service of mourning for the dead, the offerings to be made in the hall at the winter solstice and those at the grave in the spring. As a member of the community he joins in the service at the Confucian temple at the new and the full moon and particularly at the vernal and autumnal equinoxes. As an official he must sacrifice not only to the great teacher and his disciples, but he must worship also at the local altar to the spirits of the land and the

harvest, and in the temples to the various patron saints and heroes of the State. Like other religions, Confucianism has its private and its public worship; those suited to the individual, or rather the family life, and those intended for the community and the nation.

The public worship, particularly at the State altars in Peking, is very impressive. The spiritual beings who receive this homage from the State were divided under the late Manchu dynasty into three ranks. In the first rank were placed Shang Ti or the Most High God, the Imperial Ancestors, the Earth and the Guardian Spirits of the Land and the Harvests. Since the establishment of the Republic the imperial ancestors are of course omitted. In 1907, as stated above, Confucius, formerly placed in the second rank, was raised to the first grade, and still retains that position, receiving the same worship as that paid to the Most High. In the second rank were the Sun and Moon, the sovereigns of earlier dynasties, the patron saint of Agriculture, the patroness of Sericulture, and the Year Star, i.e., Jupiter. In the third rank were the patron saint of Medicine, the God of War, the God of Literature, the North Star, the Eastern Peak—i.e., Mt. T'ai in Shantung—the tutelary of Peking, the Gods of Fire and Artillery, the patron of Mechanic Arts, the God of the Furnace, the God of the Granary, and a multitude of other deities and saints increasing from generation to generation.

The religious calendar was determined by the Court of Sacrificial Worship with great care and announced a year in advance. This was made necessary by the fact that until 1912 China used a lunar calendar. The College of Astronomy had therefore to prepare an almanac showing when the winter and summer solstices would occur, whether or not there would be an intercalary moon, if so, when it was to be added, how many days were to be allowed to each month in the next year, and the exact

time when the new and full moons would occur; so that, while the times and seasons for sacrifice were known in a general way, the exact dates had to be determined.

Worship of the various gods and saints consisted in bathing, fasting, prostrations, prayers and thanksgiving, offerings of incense, lighted candles, gems, fruits, cooked food, salted vegetables and shew bread, libations of wine, sacrifices of whole oxen, sheep, and pigs, sometimes of deer and other game, and on certain occasions a burnt sacrifice of a whole bullock. The worship was accompanied by music and posturing or dancing. All sacrifices of the first grade had to be preceded by three days of fasting; those of the second grade by two days of abstinence. Warning notices were posted in all the palaces and yamens throughout the country. Fasting did not mean entire abstinence from food, but from flesh and strong-smelling vegetables, such as garlic, leeks, and onions, and also from wine and all strong drink. No criminal proceedings were to be held by the courts, and no invitations to feasts issued or accepted. There could be no music, no inquiries after the sick, and no mourning for the dead. One was especially forbidden to enter the death chamber of a woman, to sacrifice to the spirits of the family, or to visit the tombs. All association with the sick and the mourner was forbidden to those participating in the State worship. These prohibitions remind us of those enforced in connection with the Hebrew sacrifices, which forbade Aaron and his sons to drink any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle, and warned them not to mourn for the dead when serving there. The prayers offered were written and read and then burned. Those offered at the Altar to Heaven were written on blue paper in vermilion ink. This practice still prevails under the Republic.

Color, form, and number all play an important part in the construction of the temples and their furniture and in all the ceremonies connected with the worship. The prevailing color at the Temple of Heaven is blue—the azure of the sky. But the word for blue which is used is one of those primitive words which may mean blue or green. Primitive man evidently considered these as two shades of one color, for we find that in several languages one word is used for both colors. The Chinese word *Ch'ing* may mean the blue of the sky or the green of the grass. The jade emblem offered to Shang Ti is translated "the azure jade," but can just as well be translated green jade, and as a matter of fact the piece in use in recent years is green. The tiles of the pavilions at the Altar to Heaven are blue, but those on some of the other buildings in the temple are green; the silk offered is blue, and all the pottery is of a blue color. Yellow, the color of the soil in North China, is the prevailing color at the Temple of the Earth, and the gem offered is yellow. The prayer is written on yellow paper and the silk offered is yellow. Red is the prevailing color at the Altar to the Sun, and the gem is red, as is the silk also. The prayer is written on vermilion paper. At the Altar to the Moon the gem and the silk are white. The Sheh Chi T'ang, or the Altar to the Spirits of the Land and the Harvest, is peculiar in that it is made of soil of five colors: yellow in the centre, blue on the east, red on the south, white on the west, and black on the north. The glazed brick walls surrounding the court of the altar are colored in the same way. You will note that these are the five colors of the new Chinese flag. They are what the Chinese regard as the primary colors. The flag, however, is not a new one, but was often seen on Chinese gunboats long before the revolution. Originally it had no relation to the five races. The arrangement of colors is

as old as Chinese history and is mentioned in the Book of History. The five colors are correlated with the five directions—north, south, east, west, and centre; with the five tones of the old pentatonic scale, and with the five virtues—mercy, justice, piety, wisdom, and sincerity. Since the establishment of the Republic this combination of colors has been given a new symbolical meaning and made to represent the five races included in the Republic—Chinese, Manchu, Mongol, Turki, and Tibetan.

The circle is appropriate to Heaven; hence the Altar to Heaven and all its vessels are round. In the old cosmogony the earth was considered square, and so the Altar to the Earth and all its vessels are square. Odd numbers belong to Heaven and even ones to earth. Three is the key-number of the Temple of Heaven. There are three terraces on the altar, three flag-staffs, three times three steps from the ground to the first terrace and from one terrace to another, three times three stones in the first circle of paving stones around the central stone of the top terrace, and a multiple of three in each circle. There were three times three kotows[5] in the worship there, three times three pieces of music, and three sorts of beings worshipped—Heaven, Earth, and Man. Four and eight are the prevailing numbers at the Altar to the Earth, seven at the Altar to the Sun, and six at that to the Moon. Direction, posture, and time also have their meaning. At the Altar to Heaven one worships toward the north, the side of darkness, on the longest night in the year; at the Altar to the Earth, on the longest day in the year, in the daylight and facing the south; at the Altar to the Sun in the spring at sunrise facing the east, and after sunset in autumn at the Altar to the Moon, facing the west.

[5] The recent revision of the ritual by the Republic appears to have ignored this numerical symbolism, since the three kneelings and nine kotows have been replaced by four bows.

Color, direction, posture, and the use of gems, as we know, are all common to many religions. We have but to mention the cardinal's robe and the bishop's purple; the worship of the Moslems towards Mecca, of the Jews towards Jerusalem, and of many Christians towards the east; the orientation of many churches; the use of gems in the ephod of the Jewish High Priest and in the bishop's ring, and the play upon numbers in ecclesiastical architecture and liturgy.

The sacrifice of animals, accompanied by offerings of wine and incense, lighted lamps or candles, and cooked food and fruits, is common to many religions. What was the meaning of animal sacrifice in the State religion of China? For that we must turn to the ancient Chinese classics: "Sacrifice is for prayer, for thanksgiving, and to ward off calamity." So we read in the *Book of Rites*. It has been said that there is no idea of expiation in Chinese sacrifice but only that of propitiation. This is probably correct; but we must remember that calamities, personal or national, in China are all regarded as punishments for sins committed, and the sacrifice is not merely a charm to ward off evil but is sometimes accompanied by a confession and intended to placate the divine being. Probably the conception of substitution did not occur to them, but there is a significant passage in the *Li Ki* which says, "The blood was offered because it contained the life (or breath)." This is a near approach to the passage in the book of Leviticus: "The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls." It is to be noted too that a difference is to be made between the animals offered on the marble altar and those consumed on the altar of burnt offering. The former were a part of a sacrificial feast, a communion. The animals had to be without spot or blemish. The sacrifice to Shang

Ti was a young bullock. The killing was a matter of importance, and in all sacrifices of the first grade had to be witnessed by the Emperor in person or by his delegate. In the *Book of Rites* we read: "The sacrifice to God in the suburb is the highest act of worship; the offerings in the ancestral temple form the highest expression of human relationship." Just as in the Hebrew ritual "the bodies of those beasts whose blood was brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest for sin" "were burned without the camp," or, in later Jewish history, "outside the gate of the city," so also the bullock sacrificed at the Altar to Heaven as a solitary burnt offering to God was burned outside the city gate.

There has never been in China but one recognized altar to Shang Ti, the Most High God. To erect a second was as great an act of treason as among the Hebrews it was to raise an altar to Jehovah anywhere else than in Jerusalem. In both cases the worship of the Most High was centralized at the capital. The large park in the southern suburb of Peking known as the Temple of Heaven consists of a series of courts one within another. Admission to the outer court can be had only upon the west side. There are gates to the inner court on the east, west, and south, but none on the north, which the Chinese call the side of darkness. The inner court is divided into two sections. The northern contains the beautiful triple-roofed pavilion where prayers were offered every spring for a good harvest, but the most important part of the temple is the southern section. In the midst of this is a smaller court, the square court of the altar, within which is a circular court, containing the open, circular, white marble altar. This altar is composed of three terraces. Four flights of steps, one from each cardinal point of the compass, give ascent. On the topmost terrace, on its northern side, there was erected a tabernacle of boards fitted

together with tenons and sockets, which was in imperial days lined with yellow satin and covered outside with blue silk. Within this on a throne was placed the tablet inscribed with the words, "The Most High God of Imperial Heaven." The altar of burnt offering is in the southeast corner of the square court. It is built of green tiles and has steps for ascent on the east, west, and south.

On the day preceding the sacrifice the Emperor was carried in his palanquin from his palace to the temple. Every house and shop along his route was closed and curtains cut off all view from the cross-streets. Guards lined the street on either side, but all other persons were forbidden to use the street. The trains were forbidden to enter or leave the city, and a sabbath-like stillness prevailed in that quarter of the capital. The sacrifice was offered just before daylight. The Emperor had to enter the inner court on foot and from the south. Just outside the southern gate of the square court of the altar a tent was placed in which he exchanged his imperial dress for the high-priestly robe. On emerging he was met by attendants with ewer and basin and washed his hands before ascending the altar. The Jewish priests too, we remember, bathed in the laver before offering sacrifice. The circular court was filled with musicians and posturers. Bells, drums, cymbals, stringed and wind instruments, were arranged on either side of the central way. The Emperor ascended the high altar from the south, facing the north, as the Jewish High Priest also did when sacrificing in the temple. Five pedestals stood in the middle of the uppermost terrace. They were of white marble delicately carved. Upon the central one was the golden censer; on either side of it a golden candlestick. The outermost pair supported vases with gilded flowers. Just before the tabernacle of the Most High there was placed a trencher con-

taining the body of a bullock, flayed. A table at one side received the offerings of wine, jade, and silk; upon another the imperial prayer was placed. After the various offerings and libations, the prayer was read and the Emperor, kneeling, partook of the meat offering and wine, thus communing with the Most High and with his ancestors. When this service was completed, he faced the altar of burnt offering and watched the bullock there being consumed.

The service as conducted by the President last December made very few changes in this ritual. One published account, however, says that the burnt offering was omitted. It is to be noted too that the President did not leave his palace until the morning of the sacrifice, and drove there in a motor car.

In the very incomplete description of the Confucian worship just given certain similarities will have been noticed between the ceremonies of the Chinese and those of the ancient Hebrews; others might be pointed out. There is a strong temptation, therefore, to find some connection between them. If we accept the theory of the western origin of the Chinese, it is not difficult to believe that the two religions may have had a common origin; but we should not allow our desire to find a monotheism in ancient China to blind us to the real character of the Chinese State religion.

The relation of the Confucian religion to the moral standards of the people is a very intimate one. The Confucian classics, which are the sacred books, hold ever before the Chinese student a high ideal of character. Justice, mercy, self-denial, sincerity, moral courage, filial and fraternal affection—all these virtues are repeatedly emphasized. It aims to strengthen the three bonds of society—that is to say, those between parent and child, husband and wife, and between ruler and subject. Thus it seeks to provide peace in the home and order in the

State. It insists upon the worship of the spirits, but it teaches that virtuous living is a condition of acceptance with God. "The spirits are not always favorable," *The Classic of History* says; "they accept only the worship of the sincere." These scriptures teach that sickness, poverty, drought, pestilence, and war are all calamities sent as a punishment for sin. They tell us that "the ways of Shang Ti are not invariable. Upon the good he bestows blessings, upon the evil-doer he sends down calamities."

It is natural, therefore, for the Chinese to feel that the moral law finds its sanction in the national religion, and equally natural to fear that an abandonment of the national religion might lead to a deterioration in morals. When the moral standards of society are supposed to find their only sanction in religion, if that religion be abandoned, there is indeed grave danger that the less thoughtful will imagine that moral requirements have lost their authority. In such a society, unless there be stringent legislation and a strong public opinion to secure its enforcement, the individual without religion is apt to fall a prey to vice, social bonds to become relaxed, and government corrupt and inefficient.

On the whole, the influence of Confucianism has undoubtedly been beneficial. Its disestablishment would not, however, as its friends profess to believe, have necessarily meant the disintegration of society or the deterioration of the individual. The experience of the United States is just to the contrary. Religion is less formal and more powerful where it is supported not by State authority but by the free-will offerings of those who believe in it. Our country is not less religious than those which maintain established churches. The difficulty with the Confucianist has been that he cannot conceive of his religion as independent of the State. It is true that there is no organization at present except

the State, authorized to conduct its services; but the Confucian Association might have made itself such an organization, and Confucianism would undoubtedly be more influential if none but those who are its sincere adherents participated in its worship and contributed to its support. This was pointed out to Dr. Ch'en in the summer and autumn of 1913, but without effect. It might be difficult for the Confucian Association to bear the cost of the sacrifices, but these might well be abandoned. Judaism long since gave up its bloody sacrifices, yet its ethical influence is perhaps greater than ever before in its history. Dr. Ch'en contends that this might do for vegetarians, but not for meat-eaters; for he says if we omit the flesh from the sacrificial meal or communion, we withhold from those whom we worship that which we ourselves consider the most important article of diet for ourselves, that is to say, we are offering less than our best.

The feast is still today an important social function, and even in some Christian countries food is placed upon the graves of the departed upon the eve of All Souls' Day. But the progress of learning is leading men to more refined testimonials of their affection for the dead. China unfortunately has never had a prophet Micah to proclaim the worthlessness of forms and to sum up true worship in justice, mercy, and pity. There are, it is true, texts which teach that sacrifice without virtuous living is vain, but there are none which intimate that the sacrifices may be omitted. Everywhere the rites are insisted upon as important. China needs a St. Paul to reduce the rites to symbols and give an allegorical interpretation to the old ritual, and thus to substitute spiritual living for material offerings. But we must not be too exacting. The burning of incense is still practised in some Christian churches, and all retain the sacred meal of bread and wine. If it be true that

President Yüan has given up the burnt offering, he has already reduced the principal service to a sacred communion with the spirits, and there is no reason to doubt that in time the most objectionable features of the Confucian worship will be removed. The orchestral music, the paean of praise, and the prayer will remain. The worship of the dead even now to the highly educated means no more than our own memorial-day service does to us. The dead can no more detect the beauty and fragrance of the flowers than they can the flavor of the rice and wine. Above all, the excellent moral teaching of the Confucian sacred books will remain to inspire and to guide the young. The establishment of the public schools and the introduction of modern science must lead to a recognition of the world as a universe, ruled by one Divine Being, and thus the worship of the various powers of nature will die a natural death and be supplanted by the worship of Shang Ti alone.

Confucianism has always allowed the widest latitude in philosophical speculation. It has never formulated an authoritative creed. Its adherents, therefore, have no obstacle of this sort to prevent their acceptance of the conclusions of modern science. But the masses of China have never been satisfied with the intellectual recognition of God and His justice; they want something more consoling and hopeful. Hence they have supplemented their Confucianism with the mysticism and magic of Taoism and the comforting message of Buddhism, or, more properly, of that form of Buddhism which largely prevails in China — Amidism[6], which professes faith in One almighty Ruler above all the Buddhas, and which directs the sorrowing and sinful to Amida-Buddha for help and salvation, and holds out the hope, not of an unconscious nirvana, but of immortality in a paradise of happiness in the western heaven.

[6] The Ching T'u Sect referred to above.

The Chinese have the reputation of being indifferent to speculative thought, wanting in sentiment, and lacking in religious emotion; but the success of numerous native sects in Shantung and elsewhere shows that the people readily yield to religious appeals, and the gathering of multitudes in recent years to listen to the preaching of Christian evangelists is enough to prove that the struggle for bread has not entirely destroyed the hunger and thirst of the spirit.

# CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN MEDICAL ETHICS

RICHARD C. CABOT

BOSTON

[This is the third of a series of articles on the ethical standards prevalent in different occupations. The first, by Mr. John F. Moors, on "Ethics in Modern Business," appeared in the January number of THE REVIEW. The second, by ex-President Harris of Amherst College, on "The Ethics of College Students," appeared in the April number.—ED.]

The growth and shape of a human skeleton are determined, not solely by inheritance and nutrition, but partly also by what its possessor does with his bones. They become compressed here, enlarged there, in response to tugging muscles or sagging burdens.

So with medical ethics. The codes and standards of the physician depend in part on the peculiar strains and stresses, the special irritations and inspirations of his professional work. He may turn away from them all, unbranded and undeveloped by his lot. If so, he remains the exceptional man to whom the conclusions of this essay have no application.

To some extent of course every man is exceptional. His reactions to experience are in part unique, and to that extent he cuts down the truth of any generalization about him. On the other hand, he behaves in part not as a doctor or even as an American doctor but simply as an American. In this degree he develops his ethics in racial and geographic rather than in professional grooves. Nevertheless there remains such a thing as a doctor's type, a group of habits characteristic of men who have practised medicine actively and in the open

for a number of years. The doctor's ethics or habitual standards of behavior then take on a greater interest if we view them not merely as his peculiarities but as his responses to the world's call.

Now the world's call to him is something like a fire alarm. His work has somewhat the aspect of a perpetual emergency in which he must be cool and keep his head. Hence he is schooled to the control of emotion, to the repression of all instinctive impulses, disgusts, horrors, and enthusiasms. Dignity is therefore one of his traditions; although the modern doctor has thrown off, along with the frock coat, white tie, and high hat of his predecessor, much of the rigidity and stateliness which accompanied the dignity of our medical forefathers. In the modern doctor dignity takes the form of emotional reserve. He avoids the heights and depths and treads an even road. This makes him reliable when action is the cue, annoying when an adequate responsiveness is what we chiefly desire. To let oneself out of one's own grip may be all right, he thinks, for a stock-broker or a clergyman, but it is bad form for a doctor.

He often develops in this way an unusual control of temper. In emergencies it will never do to let the hand or the brain be joggled by even a pardonable thrust of anger. The layman thinks he has a right to "get mad" sometimes, but the doctor, while on duty, never, with his patient and the family, never. Of course doctors break their own rules in this as in other matters. Nevertheless the rules are there to break, clearly distinguished from the standards of "the laity."

This emotional neutrality is sometimes very annoying and even unnatural. The doctor has had to face so many horrors unmoved (in order that he may do his part in mitigating them) that he may lose the capacity to be horrified. He may become *spiritually muscle-*

*bound* by his incessant practical and motor activities, so that his mind never recoils, never revolts, never throws caution to the winds. And since there are seasons when the swift reactions of horror and revolt are every man's duty, the professional rigidity of the doctor may be his undoing. He may suffer the insufferable and be blind to the entrance of the devil himself.

Courage is bred strong in him for certain situations, weak for others. To risk his life in fighting disease he will rarely hesitate, and in this he has no self-consciousness or strut. It is a matter of course, and any member of the profession who shirks such an opportunity and refuses to play the game gets the strongest condemnation from his fellows. On the other hand, there has been until recent times little or no professional condemnation of the doctor who is too cowardly to confess his mistake on finding that he has done a wrong operation or made a disastrously wrong diagnosis. "What would be the good? We don't want to get everybody down on all of us," is the sort of thought that runs in medical minds at such a time if they are friendly to the coward. Even if they are unfriendly, they will rarely regard it as his duty to confess.

Veracity is tempered in the doctor's mind by his dominant desire to help and comfort the patient, above all things to do no harm. He is unwilling to make a fetish of truth-speaking and very keenly aware that he may not possess "the truth" at all. There was much good-natured chuckling in medical circles a few years ago when a hide-bound medical truth-teller steeled himself to the task and broke to a sick confrère the awful news that he had tuberculosis—only to discover a week later that the supposed truth was false. The sick doctor rapidly convalesced and readily forgave the mistake, but the wise pundits of the medical profession ended their chuckling with grave warnings about "You see what it

comes to—this truth business. We don't know it all by a good deal yet."

The distinction between veracity and correctness is blurred among all sorts and conditions, but perhaps nowhere so persistently as in medical ethics. That the most ignorant and therefore incorrect speaker may be utterly truthful and honest is a distinction which is ignored by many, especially when one is trying to defend the benevolent lies of the kindly doctor. In general, medical standards demand that the doctor shall never lie for his own benefit, but that in dealing with patients he shall be governed only by the patient's best interests. If those interests seem to the doctor to demand that the truth be colored, shaded, or suppressed, it is then deemed right for him to save the patient rather than the truth—especially remembering (as he muddles accuracy with honesty) that the unpleasant truth which is suppressed may turn out to be no "truth" at all.

Against this dominant tendency of medical ethics to subordinate everything—even honesty—to the patient's private interests (as the doctor sees them), two slight counter currents are beginning to make themselves felt. Both of them mark, as I see it, the direction of a force which makes for the doctor's emancipation from a servile dependence on his patient. Modern surgery and modern scientific medicine (invading the field of *traditional* medicine) tend to breed in the physician a habit of looking for truth and depending on the verdict of reality, whatever his own or others' wishes may say. The surgical incision brings him face to face with the truth or falsity of his thoughts. Extraordinarily dramatic and vivid is this relief to the mind's tension. All in a moment he is proved right or wrong, reaches the goal of his endeavor and is satisfied. Faith and groping are transformed to sight. Whatever he finds, whether his beliefs are supported or overthrown, he wins, because

once having committed and submitted himself to the arbitrament of reality, he wants that, whatever it is.

Surgery then—even bad surgery—makes for mental clearness, and mental clearness is a potent aid to veracity. Even a moderately truthful man is tempted into strict veracity of statement if the picture within his mind as he speaks is sharp cut and brightly colored. Veracity may then become the path of least resistance, so that even powerful counter motives fail to swerve it. On the other hand, in a mind full of fog, the desire to be honest easily loses its way.

This fog is dispelled and veracity strengthened not only by surgical disclosures but by the use of exact methods in diagnosis. Common to all these methods is the sort of passivity implied in *reading off a result.* As one reads the clinical thermometer, the blood-pressure instrument, the X-ray plate, one soon gets the habit of *reading aloud*—that is, of transforming what one sees immediately into speech or writing for the use of others. One lets the facts use one's tongue.

Now this mental habit (despite certain drawbacks) is a very convenient one in a doctor whose patients want to know what he finds wrong with them, and want this information undiluted and uncolored by his regard for what he considers their inability to bear the truth. A man who is in the habit of getting at facts by such a process of "reading," accustoms his mind to a kind of helpless dependence on facts. He loses the habit of freely manipulating and shaping his statements to fit what he thinks the patient wants to hear. He grows almost hypnotized by the truth as he sees it and, like Luther, "can do no other" than report it.

So I find the doctor's ethics being shaped unconsciously by the revelations of surgery and by the habit of reading off measurements on a scale. Thus he is being weaned from an undue dependence on private persons and

nourished by dependence on observed fact. But there is another new factor which begins perceptibly to reshape his ethics. I mean the recognition of public good. Formerly the doctor who could not win the favor of his neighbors, when they called him in sickness, must starve or seek other work. If the sick man and his family were afraid of open windows, the windows must be kept shut even in pneumonia, when the open window is the patient's best medicine. The "*malade imaginaire*," if she chance to be importunate and rich, could hardly be shaken off or told the bracing truths which her condition demands. The doctor must "satisfy" his patients, even if he has to humor their whims and weaknesses in a rather humiliating way. Until recently there was no money in serving the public good, and there is not much even yet, but, for reasons next to be given, a little goes a long way to change medical ethics. For even one or two public health officers, paid to disseminate the unvarnished truth about open windows, imaginary diseases, and useless drugs, get the ear of the public as no "private" doctor can and thereby make it easier for the private doctor to work straight for his patient's good, without bowing to hampering superstition. Thus the privately paid doctor grows bolder. He finds less temptation to act like a hired servant who must humor his master on pain of discharge if he doesn't. He finds it easier to make his patient listen, obey, and be educated. Thus the doctor's ethical temper becomes less servile and more independent.

American political leaders have seen of late the wisdom of appealing to the public against the tyranny of their political associates. Doctors are just beginning to use the same manœuvre. Until very recently—say within twenty years—it was highly unethical for a physician to write about health and disease in newspapers and magazines. Such publicity was considered "self-adver-

tising," which was and still is condemned as wrong by medical opinion. A man must not exploit himself and his capacities by advertising. But with the advent of the "public health movement," all this was changed. Any doctor who writes to spread generally recognized truth about the public health and about the means of preserving and improving it, is now perfectly "ethical" in the eyes of his professional brethren. He must not exploit in the public press his own discoveries nor recommend his own methods so that people shall come to him for help. That is still highly "unethical" and brings expulsion from all reputable medical societies. But whatever can properly be brought under the head of public health it is now ethical to expound when and wherever one can get a hearing.

In this way the ethical independence of the doctor is being considerably strengthened. He can appeal to the public against the "class spirit" of his more short-sighted brethren. For example, many medical societies have gone on record against "contract practice," i.e. have voted that it is unethical for a physician to hire himself out for a salary which binds him to attend, without further fee, all cases of illness in the group of persons who pay him. Despite such votes, many physicians have signed such contracts and are now doing "contract practice," sometimes for salaries so small that good work is impossible, sometimes for excellent salaries and under conditions ensuring unusually good work. But the reproach of being "unethical" in contract practice has been considerably lightened of late years by the fact that one can explain in the public press exactly the advantages to public health that come from putting the doctor and the patient on the same side against the disease, instead of having the doctor earn most when disease flourishes. It is now several years since medical societies (within my circle of knowledge) have

condemned contract practice as unethical. A doctor of my acquaintance recently said in public what every doctor says in private—that there are too many surgical operations performed by men who have not the skill to make the operation of benefit to the patient, with the result that many necessary operations are *not* done because so many people have come to distrust all or nearly all surgeons. Soon after this he was officially reprimanded by his local medical society for unethical conduct. Such statements—though no one denies their truth—should not be made to lay audiences, the society said. They diminish the public's confidence in the medical profession.

The incident illustrates the shade of truth in Bernard Shaw's remark that the medical profession (like every other profession) is a conspiracy against the public. It is impossible to advocate any medical reform in public without saying or implying that medical habits are not all they ought to be. This can be construed as an attack on the medical profession, and the profession as an organization wishes to defend itself, not selfishly, I think, but with the sincere and fallacious belief that all reforms should "come from within." When a doctor says that reforms should come from within alone, he is, I think, to a certain extent conspiring against the public which desires to see reforms fostered, like trade or thought or art, both from within and from without.

Yet this "private-spiritedness" of the medical profession, which until recent years has shaped its ethics, has in it much that is noble. It has encouraged modesty; it has curbed shameless advertising; it has preserved valuable traditions and kept the relation of doctor and patient (at their best) upon a high plane. Into this atmosphere a blast of publicity has now come and brought evil as well as good into the standards of the profession. Scientific methods, public and preventive

medicine, medical writing in newspapers and magazines, have thrown light upon dark places and opened up the doctor's activities to the public gaze. The doctor and his ethics get thereby the advantage and support of public interest. Subservience to private against public good is less tempting. Courage and independence are easier, veracity less costly.

On the other hand, it is not good for the doctor to be so much in the lime-light, to find himself the hero of so many novels, to hear his friends so glib with the slang of medical horrors and medical privacies. Something of the nobility described in *Beside the Bonnie Briar Bush* was bound up with the isolated and patriarchal position occupied by the best type of country doctor. As medicine becomes urban, public, democratic, the intimate personal relation of doctor and patient, the benefits of confession without absolution, may be diminished. Yet I think that the gain will outweigh the loss.

# THE CONTRIBUTION OF PROFESSOR HOWISON TO CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

In a previous article in *The Harvard Theological Review* the writer presented an estimate of the contribution of Professor Royce to Christian thought.[1] In the present article he endeavors to do the same with respect to another American philosopher of great significance to Christian theology, George Holmes Howison.

Among American philosophers there is none perhaps whose conception of personality is so closely bound up with the Christian Ideal as that of the eminent protagonist of Personal Idealism, whose "original and lucid thought," as Professor George Herbert Palmer once said publicly of him, "will be a factor in shaping the philosophic judgment of our time."

If Professor Royce's contribution to Christian thought is "rich, profound, and extensive," that of Professor Howison—while it too is profound—may be characterized as exceptionally stimulating and illuminating. It offers in many respects an antithesis to that of the author of *The World and the Individual*, yet both help to bring out essential truths and values of Christianity.

It is neither the proper office nor the purpose of the writer to attempt an estimate of Professor Howison's philosophy as such. It is my less ambitious purpose to endeavor to set forth, so far as the limits of such a paper will permit, its relation to Christian theology.

One can hardly approach the task from this viewpoint without noting how largely the philosophy of Professor

[1] April, 1915.

Howison, like that of his contemporaries Professors Royce and James and Dr. William T. Harris, was moulded by the earnestly religious atmosphere in which he was reared. Brought up in a Christian home in Marietta, Ohio, he graduated from Marietta College and Lane Theological Seminary. Throughout his career as a teacher he has kept in close touch with the movement of religious as well as of philosophic thought and has brought his virile mind forcibly to bear upon the higher life of his time, especially upon the Pacific Coast. Coming to the University of California in 1884 he occupied for twenty-five years the Mills chair of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity, becoming Professor Emeritus in 1909. Thus he became the founder of a real though unheralded school of philosophic thought upon the Pacific Coast which—however divergent its members may be from the system of the master—will continue to bear the impress of his ideals and of his personality. The "Philosophical Union" which he founded in 1889 has in its twenty-five years of vigorous life witnessed to the interest in philosophy which he created and maintained in Berkeley. His pupils occupy many of the leading chairs of philosophy in the universities and colleges of America.

It was in a theological atmosphere, as has been said, that he began his thinking. Stirred by religious problems, he found himself confronted with the demands of an intellectual life that had outgrown unyielding forms and demanded ampler and more adequate expression. To be at once philosopher and Christian required new wine-skins for the new wine which a severe mental discipline presses from the unfailing vintage of the enquiring spirit. A marked singleness and sincerity has characterized his thought. From the first he followed faithfully the white light of truth with unfaltering step. Certain clear and well-conceived truths have taken

shape in his mind; and these he has heralded and defended, expounded and amplified, with all the force and conviction of one who never turns back, never wavers, and never compromises. If Professor Royce's philosophy is a philosophy of loyalty, Professor Howison's is one —to use the term which he prefers to loyalty—of fealty. Sincere, undaunted, undefeated, he has maintained his principles against all comers and made himself heard far as the curse of philosophic doubt and obscuration is found.

Professor Howison came to Berkeley a Hegelian. To Hegel, as he said, he owed "many years of light and guidance."[2] But Hegelianism proved too indiscriminating and all-embracing for him. He saw that there are wrinkles in truth, like those in the California hills, that cannot be smoothed out, moral heights too great to be brought down to the level of mere monism, and chasms that yawn too deep to be filled in with complaisant developmentalism. A passing word of criticism upon a public address of his by an Oakland theologian brought his doubts to a focus and drove him to deeper foundations and the gradual construction of a system based partly on Kantian principles and having a certain resemblance to Berkeleyanism, but essentially his own. This system he has termed "Personal Idealism," or "Harmonic Pluralism." The latter term must not be allowed to confuse his system with empirical Pluralism and its universe of radically disjunct particulars, from which it is as far removed as possible.

His system of thought is clearly and succinctly set forth in his well-known volume *The Limits of Evolution*, published in 1901 and revised and much enlarged in a second edition issued in 1905.[3] The volume was received with an attention even more marked in

[2] The Limits of Evolution; Preface, p. xxvi. The citations are all from the second edition.

[3] A third edition is now in course of preparation.

Great Britain than in America. The *Athenaeum* found in it evidence of the "unquenchable energy" of American philosophy. The *Scotsman* regarded it as "singularly instructive and impressive," and Dr. McTaggart of the University of Cambridge spoke of it in *Mind* as a "most remarkable work." Besides this volume he contributed to, as well as edited, the volume *The Conception of God*, published in 1897. These two collections of writings, with a *Treatise on Analytical Geometry*, 1869, constitute the sum of his publications in separate books. To them should be added his address at the St. Louis Congress of Arts and Science in 1904, *Philosophy: Its Fundamental Conceptions and Its Methods*, printed in Volume I of the Publications of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition and several review articles upon educational as well as philosophical subjects.[4] He has been one of the associate editors of *The Hibbert Journal* from its foundation.

The best presentation of Professor Howison's contribution to theology may perhaps be made through three fundamental ideas which have been outstanding in his teaching,—God, Freedom, and Immortality. The earnestness of his emphasis upon this Kantian triad suggests the close kinship of his thought with that of Kant—an obligation which he himself freely acknowledges.[5] And yet, Kantian as he is, not only in the type of his thought but also in the temper of his mind and the strength of his emphasis upon duty, he is too good a student of Kant and too original a thinker to be merely a follower. He has his own interpretation and defences of the three great "postulates" in many respects in advance of those of the seer of Königsberg.

His Theism—to begin with that—is very definite and personal. God is conceived by him as the Perfect

[4] Especially noteworthy is a brief but striking paper on "The Origin of Concepts."

[5] The Limits of Evolution; Preface, p. xix ff.

Person, whose existence is capable of demonstration and whose relation to ourselves is that of Final Cause or Goal. In Him reason and will are one. He is the central member of the universal society of intelligences, or persons, an All-directing Intelligence "without encumbrances" and thus Perfect Love. "The worth of God is not in what He does," he declares, "but in what He is."

Conceptions of God that undermine or obscure the divine personality he confronts with all the weapons of reason and rebuke. Whether in the guise of Cosmic Consciousness or All-inclusive Absolute, these pantheistic conceptions seem to him to affront intelligence and to contradict morality. In the notable philosophical debate of 1895 at the University of California, he contended with force and skill against both of these tendencies. The first, as represented by Professor Joseph LeConte he met with the question: "So long as man remains a term in nature, how can he escape from that causal embrace in which Nature is held immanent in God?"[6] To the second, as advocated by Professor Royce, he advanced this objection:

> "If the Infinite Self *includes* us all, and all our experiences—sensations and sins, as well as the rest—in the unity of one life, and includes us and them *directly;* if there is but one and the same final Self for us each and all; then with a literalness indeed appalling He is we, and we are He, nay, He is *I* and *I* am He. . . . Or, if we read the conception in the second way, what becomes of *Him*? Then, surely, He is but another name for *me;* or for any of you, if you will. And how can there be talk of a Moral Order, since there is but a single mind in the case? We cannot legitimately call that mind a *person*." [7]

This is but a single instance of the pointedness and vigor with which he has indefatigably challenged what he has been wont to call the "almighty mix" of the Hegelian conception of God in all its phases. "God,"

[6] The Conception of God; p. 117. [7] Ibid. pp. 98, 99.

he affirms, "is not an intermeddler; He is omniscient because He does not leave any other mind out. About the fate of every one He is intensely concerned; yet He respects the integrity and autonomy which is the sacred possession of each."

In uncompromising hostility to the philosophy of the unknowable, or agnosticism, to the Cosmic Consciousness of naturalism and to the Universal Self of monism,[8] Professor Howison has taken the field in behalf of the "Perfect Guide and Friend," the "Impersonated Love," of whom Jesus taught, the "Father in Heaven" who is Personal Perfection. The God who is thus the "Centre of reference," the "Living Bond" for all selves, is according to this view under moral obligations to other persons, just as they are to Him. Reciprocal personality, the "reciprocity of first causes"—for which there is no room in monism—is the only personality that is genuine:

> "For the very quality of personality is, that a person is a being who recognizes others as having a reality as unquestionable as his own, and who thus sees himself as a member of a moral republic, standing to other persons in an immutable relationship of reciprocal duties and rights, himself endowed with dignity and acknowledging the dignity of all the rest."[9]

One of the chief obstacles to the understanding of the nature and reality of personality has been that it has been defined over against the world merely as the *not-self*, rather than in terms of its relation to other persons. Professor Howison has done much to correct this point of view.

The existence of this Supreme Instance, personally conceived, he regards as involving strict demonstrability. The demonstration may be formulated thus: The idea

[8] A most careful and illuminating discussion of the relation of the One to the Many may be found in Professor Howison's paper at the St. Louis Congress of Arts and Science, in which he contrasts the unity of harmony with that of absorption.

[9] The Limits of Evolution; p. 7.

of self involves in the last resort the idea of God, as the One Perfect Self by final reference to whom each self defines itself as imperfect or "finite." Every member of the republic of persons, though indeed defining himself against each of his fellows, must define himself, in ultimate logic, against the Supreme Instance, and so in terms of God.[10] Put in syllogistic form, the argument runs as follows:

> "The *idea* of every self and the *idea* of God are inseparably connected, so that if any self exists then God also must exist; but any and every self demonstrably exists, for (as *apud Cartesium*) the very doubt of its existence implies its existence; and therefore God really exists." [11]

One of his most luminous and characteristic terms in defining the realm of persons—or "the city of God," as he calls it, with Augustine and the Stoics—is *recognition*. He uses it constantly and designedly to describe God's attitude toward other persons. The very perfection of God, he declares, "lies in his giving complete recognition to all other spirits." [12] What more than this simple act of recognition—one cannot but ask—is needed to assure us, upon our part, of His existence? Yet Professor Howison is not content with this, but constantly insists upon the necessity of rational *demonstration*. Such demonstration of God doubtless has its place and value, but the genius of Personalism gives it secondary rather than primary importance. Indeed we must not too hastily confound the Personal Idealism of Professor Howison with more spiritual forms of Personalism. It is throughout a philosophy of knowledge rather than of communion. In other words, it lacks the element of mysticism which, as it seems to me, is inseparable from a complete Personalism.

With what has seemed to many—perhaps to most—of his readers and pupils an inexplicable rigor, he has

[10] The Limits of Evolution; p. 355. [11] Ibid. p. 359. [12] See also Ibid. p. 258 ff.

maintained that God, being the final cause, cannot be the efficient cause, either of the natural universe or of the republic of persons. God cannot be the creator of persons, because every self is, he asserts, by the very nature of selfhood, a *causa sui*; its relation to God is a logical, not a material relation. Nor can the outer world be the creation of God. It is too unlike Him. Its very imperfection and evil, our author declared in an article in *The Hibbert Journal* discussing the disaster of Mont Pelée,[13] proves that it cannot be the work of a beneficent and omnipotent Creator. "It cannot be Eternal Love that bursts forth and scorches and suffocates from a Mont Pelée." Yet the world cannot be a *self-existent* material reality, for there is no such reality. "All existence is either the existence of *minds*, or the existence of the *items* and *order* of *their experience*."[14] No; the outer world is the creation, or rather the *derivative*, of all the minds other than God, acting together, the bad as well as the good. Hence the imperfection and evil manifest within it.

This critique of orthodox mechanical creationism is too forceful to be set aside. The question is, however, whether it does not deny too much—more than the author's own theory requires or warrants. He holds final cause to be "the originating and organizing member of the system of causes."[15] Why not then the originating cause of the selves? Indeed it is difficult to separate final cause and originating cause. Does not final causality carry with it origination? He who is our end can hardly be less than our origin also.[16] And yet, this insistence upon final causation is extremely pertinent. There is more occasion for the transference of emphasis from efficient to final causality than appears upon the surface. Whoever is concerned for the higher conception

[13] Hibbert Journal; vol. i, no. 1. [14] Op. cit. p. xii. [15] P. 365.

[16] A criticism of Dr. Howison's theory of creation may be found in Professor James Ward's well-known volume, "The Realm of Ends"; pp. 455–460.

of God can but approve the endeavor to reduce efficient cause "from that supreme place in philosophy which this has hitherto held and give the highest, the organizing place to Final Cause instead."[17]

But granted that Professor Howison's insistence upon the *priority* of final cause is right; is he warranted in denying all other causality to God? According to his own account, the world is derived from *minds*. Can it be then that it is the product solely of minds other than God? The growing conception of co-operant creation—according to which God is the origin and ground of a developing universe in which all minds, yes, all forms of life, have a subordinate but contributory part—fulfils the substance of his contention.[18] This creative agency increases in scope as the scale of being ascends toward selfhood. The self is thus chiefly responsible for the character (though not necessarily for the possibility) of its own existence.

The second cardinal principle of the system—freedom—is conceived and defended with all of its author's characteristic clarity of thought, skill of argument, and pungency of statement. Freedom, from his point of view, is grounded, not in the will as a faculty of the mind, but in the self, whose very nature it is to be self-existent and free. Underived, autonomous, inviolable (save by itself), according to personal idealism, is the self. It lays its own imperative upon itself. Complex, not simple, the self is yet a unit. "Every rational being is a self-referred being. Self-reference is of the very essence of reason." The self is impenetrable. He is full of scorn for what he calls "the glory in gregariousness" so rampant today. While not denying the mutual influence of the selves upon one another, he rejects the idea of interpenetration. Immanence he regards as inconsonant

[17] Op. cit. Preface; p. xvii.

[18] In fact, Professor Howison has himself, in one place at least, recognized this principle of creative co-operation (p. 199) which he elsewhere so explicitly rejects.

with personality. "No self can get into another and operate there. Neither the devil nor God can get into us. Nothing is more despicable than the idea that someone else is working in you." "Unless I am autonomous I can't be right."[19]

This recognition of the individuality of selfhood is as much needed as it is true to consciousness. Without the violation of freedom, however, the intimacy and potency of our personal relations, both with one another and with God, is such, it seems to me, as to require no less a term than immanence—used of course in a symbolic sense. Yet Professor Howison is no solipsist. Not less certain than the truth that the self is and must be a reality *in* itself is the complementary truth, of which he makes much, that the self is not and cannot be alone, by itself. Selfhood is social as truly as it is autonomous. "In thinking itself as eternally real, each spirit inherently thinks the reality of all other spirits."[20] Emphasis upon the social nature of selfhood is so strong as to remove personal idealism as far as possible from being bare individualism, radical egoism. It is as truly a social idealism as a personal idealism. The members of the Eternal Republic "exist only in and through their mutually thought correlation, their eternal 'City,' and out of it would be non-existent." Thus is personal idealism completely saved from solipsism. "A mind thinking 'I' inevitably correlates the thought *thou and they*." The very core of morality is to recognize other persons. "Righteousness is the faithful recognition of other persons as ends."[21]

[19] From notes taken at one of a series of informal talks upon philosophy given to a small group of his friends at his home in the spring of 1914. A number of other quoted statements are either from these talks or from private conversations.

[20] The Limits of Evolution; p. 353.

[21] It would be difficult to overstate this saving emphasis of Professor Howison upon Otherhood. He once said to the writer that he regarded the reciprocal nature of personality as the main factor in his philosophy. "Reciprocity might be taken as its one supreme watchword."

But freedom is not the only fact of experience. It is offset by determinism. How can freedom and determinism be reconciled? Professor Howison essays this Herculean task in his essay, *The Harmony of Determinism and Freedom.* It is impossible here to do more than allude to this closely wrought and remarkable piece of philosophical analysis. It must suffice to state that the solution of the problem is secured by the absolute exclusion of the idea of an external determinism imposed upon the soul either by nature or by God. Indeed, all the determinism we really know is resolvable into that law of definiteness which the rational mind itself imposes upon its experience. "Freedom and determinism are only the obverse and the reverse of the two-faced fact of rational self-activity. Freedom is the thought-action of the self, defining its specific identity, and determinism means nothing but the definite character which the rational nature of the action involves."[22] Whether this drawing of the fangs of determinism settles the great enigma or not, it certainly contributes to its solution a factor hitherto too far overlooked—the rationality of determinism as well as of freedom.

Side by side with the truths of God and Freedom Professor Howison places Immortality. From his confidence in the truth and supreme significance of Immortality this defender of the dignity of the soul never for a moment wavers. In an age of hesitant non-commitalism such a rational confidence is reassuring. For it rests upon no mere sentimental desire or vagrant imagining, but upon a conviction that has been matured by long reflection and that has weathered many seasons of besieging question and popular dismay.

The essay entitled "Human Immortality" in *The Limits of Evolution*, consists of a clear exposition and brilliant criticism of Professor James's Ingersoll lecture

[22] Op. cit. p. 375.

on Immortality, in which the *brain transmission* theory of the latter is taken up at precisely the point at which it begins to lose value and cogency and is carried forward into an application which redeems it from the vague impersonalism in which James leaves it. In place of the immortality of a differentiated "Mother Sea of consciousness," Howison offers us the definiteness of a genuinely personal and ethical individual immortality. The argument may appear to some to pause too long over the theory of parallelism, but as a matter of fact, the discussion of the theory of parallelism is but incidental to the main argument, which is based upon the "imperishable self-resource of the individual spirit."[23]

The argument turns largely upon proving time to be "a consciousness *a priori*; that is, an act of the soul, of the individual mind, in the spontaneous unity of its existence."[24] This established,

"our discussion in proving Time to be an expression of each mind's spontaneous activity, proves the self-active existence of every mind as such, and so establishes the eternity of the individual spirit in the only ultimate meaning of eternity; since, as the ground and source of Time itself, the being of the soul must transcend time, though including time."[25]

From this point the argument moves on to include space and cause as trophies of the immortal soul:

"Thus we conclude to the dependence of Nature upon *us*, taken in our primary and active being, instead of our derivative dependence upon Nature. In the place then of death's ending *us*—death, but one item in the being of the natural world, the whole of which is conditioned upon the central self-consciousness—we arrive at the settled and logically immovable conception that we are ourselves the changeless ground of that transition in experience into which death thus gets interpreted."[26]

This conception of immortality manifestly involves,

[23] Op. cit. p. 308.
[24] Ibid. p. 301.
[25] Ibid. p. 304.
[26] Ibid. p. 306.

as does his entire theory of personality, the super-existence of persons. This is not pre-existence, nor is it to be construed as in any way involving metempsychosis or transmigration in any form. It is rather an affirmation of the essential superiority of the soul to time, a protest against the incongruous notion that as persons we can have a beginning in time. If time is in any sense a postulate of the mind itself, it is indeed incongruous to think of the soul as having a beginning in that which has no existence apart from the mind's own activity. One can be born into the already existent time-world of other minds, but so far as the individual is concerned time takes its rise in him rather than he in time. As a matter of fact, the time concept is seen, upon careful thought, to be in itself irrelevant to the idea of the origin of the spirit. The term "pre-existent" as applied to the soul is as irrelevant as time-existent. The only strictly relevant issue here is that between the self-existence of the soul and its existence as deriving from the Supreme Person. I find myself, as I have already indicated, unable to follow Professor Howison in ascribing self-origination to human persons. Consciousness seems to me to witness to a receptive-active process by which finite personality comes to be what it is—a process of continuous appropriation from a personal source. This may be called an eternity-process rather than a time-process, in that it has no direct relation to time.[27] Yet this difference of interpretation does not modify the real force of the argument for immortality here presented, nor leave it less than one of the noblest and most impressive utterances upon this theme which Philosophy has put forth.

At a time of uncertainty and readjustment in Christian thought this philosopher of trained mind and clear vision

[27] By "time" as here used is meant, not Bergson's "la durée," which suggests the idea of eternity, but time in the sense of "the fleeting world of phenomena." See Professor Howison's address at the St. Louis Congress, p. 185 ff.

has produced what he has called a "new apologetic," whose profoundly Christian character and cogency have not yet been realized. This new apologetic was admirably set forth (under the questionable term "rationalism") in the address before the Congress of Religion in San Francisco in 1894.[28] He presents it as not only rationally demonstrable but as clearly taught by Jesus. It is a predominantly ethical apologetic. The ethical note is, in fact, dominant in all his teaching,[29] lending it a reality and virility which have given to his classroom in Ethics and to all his contact with his friends and with the community a wholesome atmosphere of tonic sincerity. Indeed, this spirit of integrity and of fealty to the ideal have made his personality a tower of strength and an example of uprightness of inestimable worth to all who know him. In his devotion to Duty he resembles Kant. "You cannot read Kant," he once said to a company of teachers of philosophy, "without a conviction of sin. You should not live too much with any book that does not induce this in you."

Fault-finders have maintained that there is no place in this system for the great Christian doctrines of regeneration, the Holy Spirit, and atonement. If it were a system of theology instead of a philosophy, this might be a just criticism. The recognition of the mystical and revelatory nature of truth is indeed somewhat lacking in the system, which sometimes gives the impression of clear, cold intellectualism. Yet there are many passages in *The Limits of Evolution*, especially in the essay on "The Art-Principle in Poetry," not only full of profound insight but rich in æsthetic and spiritual feeling. The author's sense of the creative nature of art, of "joy in the ideal," and his sympathetic

[28] "The Right Relation of Reason to Religion," The Limits of Evolution; p. 217 ff.

[29] Dr. McGiffert recognizes this in his survey of Howison's philosophy in his recent volume, "The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas"; pp. 231–233.

appreciation of Emerson evince this intuitive and imaginative spirit. The term "intelligence," which he most frequently employs to designate the organ of truth, conveys the impression of truth-discovery as a purely intellectual and ratiocinative process; but a more careful study of his use of "intelligence" discloses the fact that he intends by it "primarily moral cognition." Indeed, in the address upon "The Right Relation of Reason to Religion," he states that he means by reason "the human powers of insight in their completest scope, and not merely the faculty of 'reasoning,' or consistent and consecutive syllogizing, or 'explaining' and 'proving' in this mechanical sense."[30] He also speaks with approval of the evidence of personal experience, "the evidence not of mere reasoning, but of the large and deep rational nature as a whole."[31] Such words are to be taken, not as in any sense disparaging the logical faculty or the function of demonstration, of which he is the unflinching champion, but as showing the breadth and depth of his conception of our intelligence, which he has always contended is of the same generic nature as that of God Himself. "The infinite of the soul is mightier than the finite in it."[32]

Another serious misunderstanding of Professor Howison, on the part of certain objectors, has been the notion that he underrates the Bible. It is a superficial conclusion, drawn chiefly from his thorough sympathy with the method and results of Higher Criticism, the pathway which for so many modern minds has led to a new and deeper appreciation of the Bible, both as literature and as doctrine of life. In a speech at a dinner given in honor of Dr. Henry Van Dyke at the University Club in San Francisco, he declared with earnestness: "I certainly deal with the Bible in my classes, and I will never cease until the Regents compel me"; and that

[30] Op. cit. p. 231. [31] Ibid. p. 265. [32] Ibid. p. 373.

could only be—as all his friends knew well—by the compulsion of removal. The mind of Paul is, in most respects, especially congenial to him, with the exception of the Rabbinism, and what he regards as the ambiguous declaration in the Mars Hill speech—"For in Him we live and move and have our being"; which he thinks (if really Paul's and not Luke's) has been naturally taken as pantheistic, though probably not so intended by Paul. The doctrine of election he regards as essentially foreign to Paul, declaring that if Paul should return, he would exclaim, "How in the world did you get that doctrine of election from me?"

If at times in combative moods and upon occasions in which it has seemed to him to be his duty to hew the Agag of unthinking orthodoxism in pieces, he has shown an excessive aggressivism, at other times, especially in smaller circles, he speaks with a calm, an eloquence, and an insight that have earned for him among his friends the reputation of being one of the most fascinating and impressive of conversationalists, an American Coleridge with less of the rhapsodical.

So convinced and thoroughgoing an idealism as that of Professor Howison stands in sharp contrast with the questioning, inconclusive doctrinaire philosophy now in vogue. It gives him in these his ripened years a certain Socratic character. One is aware that he has convictions—of whose reality and worth he is so sure that he would fain make you, also, sure of them. This imparts to him too an atmosphere, not of aloofness from the events occurring about him but of a genuine elevation above them, as if he were regarding them *sub specie eternitatis.* When he remarks, for instance, that "history is a succession of fits, out of which man comes with pain and suffering," one realizes that this is not quite the sort of observation that he hears from the man on the street. The calm though serious opti-

mism of the thinker invests him, revealing the reasoned foundation upon which his every-day thought and life are built. With the timid and hesitant character of so much modern thinking he has no sympathy, declaring that we have no business to be so unstable and unsure. He admits the presence of perplexities, but affirms that "all our uncertainties are embosomed in certainties."

The published material constituting Professor Howison's contribution to religious thought, though small, is exceedingly significant. It is a treasure of refined gold. It may be doubted if anyone in the field either of philosophy or of theology has so clearly and firmly apprehended or so succinctly and enduringly stated that central truth of Christian philosophy—the determinative reality and complete mutuality of personality.

The indebtedness of the philosophical and theological world to the philosophy of Professor Howison is far greater than is generally understood. Indications of the impression it has made upon thoughtful minds can hardly have escaped the attention of the observant reader of recent English and American philosophy and theology. This influence, though it may not be fully recognized for a long time, is almost certain to continue and to deepen.

Divested of some of its more extraneous polemic and contemporary features, *The Limits of Evolution* (the title is too limited) presents, as Professor Caldecott has said, "a powerful brief for the ethical type of theism," and is not unlikely to become a classic of idealistic and Christian philosophy, standing as one of the luminous achievements among the philosophic interpretations of the life of the spirit. It has a certain maturity and conclusiveness that cannot fail to beget conviction and deepen assurance in the great abiding realities of God and the soul. When Philosophy takes itself in as high and serious a spirit as in the case of Professor Howison,

fronting the great issues of life and truth with an earnest and courageous freedom, it can hardly fail to throw light upon the true character and mission of Christianity. For Christianity is no narrow creed for despairing minds. It is as deep as the human soul and as wide and varied as are the boundless needs of man.

"The aim of such a religion is not merely to 'glorify God'; rather it is to glorify all souls, as all in the image of God; to glorify them by fulfilling for every one of them its vocation to repeat in a new way the life of universal love that is the life of God, and thus to attain, through the universal greatening, such a real glorification of God as other religions seek after in vain."[33]

[33] Op. cit. p. 255.

# THE EFFECT UPON THE CHURCHES OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

GEORGE F. KENNGOTT

Los Angeles

For a generation or so the world has been tending to regard life from a social, an organic point of view, and this has developed into Socialism, strictly so called. The Churches have endeavored to meet this sometimes by opposing the principle and addressing themselves still to the individual, and sometimes by adopting it and becoming benevolent institutions for the ameliorating of the conditions of living. What is in general the result, not so much upon the world as upon themselves? Is the social motive likely to be profound and permanent? Is it, as some claim, the Gospel; or, as others claim, distinctly not the Gospel? These interesting questions were propounded to several hundred leading clergymen of different denominations throughout the country, and some of the answers are as follows:

(1.) "The social motive is bound to have a very profound and permanent influence in the shaping of the Christian message as well as in the formation of Christian living. I believe there will be more rather than less emphasis upon this for at least a decade. Already elements in society are beginning to feel the influence of this accent, and more and more men of prominence, who were indifferent to such a word formerly, are coming to see the advisability and the value of giving it heed, realizing that it has a tremendous effect upon, as well as a very large place in, the life of society. I believe, however, that the tendency has been, especially with leaders of a one-sided type of mind, to exaggerate the matter, and by extravagance of language, method, and purpose, to alienate many and distinctly to hamper the progress of a very desirable movement. This, however, is but incidental to advance along any lines, and will in the end be discounted at its proper value. I am, however, not so keen for this socialization of the religious appeal as some,

feeling that there is an inclination, much to be regretted, to neglect what I believe is the fundamental element—the individual appeal and conduct. It is impossible for a church to get away from this, and my observation has led me to feel that those churches or institutions which seemed to have dropped this in the interest of the special social message, have distinctly weakened their life and influence. My own belief is that the increase of emphasis on the social message will make for the larger realization of the place and aim of the individual, and that already our sanest and strongest leaders are seeing this fact."

(2.) "We believe that the people need to be supernaturally regenerated, and subsequently sanctified wholly. That when thus saved from *all* sin, they enjoy the happiest and most useful life here and have an assurance of heaven. In my humble judgment, too much emphasis on 'Social Service' has a tendency to *materialize* the gospel and lead the churches away from the gospel's supernatural power. The Bible nowhere commands men to do, do, do; but to *be, be, be. Be filled with the Spirit,* and Christian activity naturally follows."

(3.) "My own view is that the social message of the gospel has an important place in the work of the Kingdom, but not the primary place. So long as it is kept tributary to the spiritual and eternal interests of men, it is well and must not be neglected. But if it be given first place and made the real end of the gospel message, it must necessarily give to the minds of men a very inadequate and distorted view of the whole subject. Philanthropy and social betterment are excellent, as the outgrowth of Christianity, but cannot successfully be made substitutes for it, though many seem to be trying to do so. Honesty, for example, is one of the results of regeneration, but can never be a real substitute for it. There has never been any real and lasting social betterment in the world except that which was produced by Christianity in the hearts and lives of men. Men must be brought into right relation to God before they can ever be in right relation to their fellow men. Love to God comes first, and then love to neighbors follows. Both phases of the gospel are important. The important thing is to keep them in right relation to each other, giving to each its due share of emphasis."

(4.) "The effect upon the churches of the social movement is altogether good. On the other hand, the social movement is in need of the fellowship, sympathy, and religious inspiration of the churches. The social movement needs the vitalization of genuine

Christianity, and the churches as representing Christianity need the humanizing and utilitarian quickening which is indicated by the current social movement. I believe the correct attitude for the Church is the adoption of the socialistic principle, and the direction of it sanely and joyfully into concrete application in the solution of the perplexing problems that are indicated in the present social order. I believe that the social movement is destined to be powerful and permanent, for it is genuinely Christ-like."

(5.) "Where the Church lays all its emphasis upon the individual, it gets out of touch, antiquated, and lags behind in the world-march. Where the Church lays stress only upon the social conditions of the day and gets absorbed in righting the social wrongs, it forgets the individual and his personal relationship to a saving gospel. The ideal Church is the one that strikes a balance between the two, reaching the individual to reach society and touching the social conditions to develop the individual. This is the gospel in its outreach. So far as I have found, there are so many different views on socialistic problems that the condition has not yet been reached where we can call the motive profound and permanent, although it may be moving fast toward that stage. Just now it is more divided than the Church into sects, and that is its great weakness. Its program is not yet deep enough or profound enough to grip with a lasting grip the lives and hearts of all men. I find that the antagonism against the Church is growing less, that it is recognized as a helpful factor in need; but I also find that with but few exceptions, little is added to the Church beyond the consciousness of having responded to a need. Socialism is not the gospel. The gospel is not Socialism. But certain phases of Socialism are the outgrowth of the gospel seeking to translate itself into terms of Christian life."

(6.) "The reaction upon the Church of the new social emphasis in religion has already proved profoundly beneficial, as a corrective of its earlier preoccupation with the problems of the individual. It has been a return to the spirit of its Lord and Master, and as such cannot but be reviving and helpful. Long ago, however, signs appeared of an equally injurious preoccupation with this new aspect of religious activity, in the attempt to push the social motive into the forefront and to try to find in the social message a gospel that replaces the gospel of Divine Love. Until one can reverse the two great commandments and build the second upon the first, all such efforts must be hurtful to the Church's life. As Peabody justly says: 'Jesus' social teaching was a by-product of his religious mes-

sage. . . . Behind all the teachings of Jesus Christ concerning problems of . . . ethics, lies his supreme concern for the individual life to which he may give power.' The forgetfulness of this primary emphasis of the teaching of Jesus is involving a considerable section of our church in barrenness and superficiality."

(7.) "The current emphasis on the social motive of the gospel is of great value but is temporary. The apparent failure of individual Christians to carry into the social life the teaching of the gospel as revealed in existing social injustices has gripped the soul of religious leaders of a certain type. The presentation of these social problems by those who sought to discredit Christianity thereby has inspired action; consequently the social note became dominant in many churches. It is well. But it will not be permanently dominant in the churches, for the true motive is personal righteousness. This is the core of the gospel, and upon its acceptation depends a righteous society. The result upon the churches of the social movement has, upon the whole, been good. It aroused many who acted as though this world were a negligible quantity, the only desirable goal being the spiritual life entered into at death. The social movement emphasized the thought, thoroughly characteristic of the New Testament, that this earth is to be the scene of the Kingdom of God. This so far has not bulked very large because of its misunderstanding by many Christians. It will result in giving the gospel a larger place in the life of organized society, and the churches a recognized place in the forces that make for righteousness."

(8.) "The social movement seems to me to be the coming factor in the mighty movement for 'Freedom' or for 'Democracy' which is beginning to reveal the outline of a new civilization. It began in the demand for spiritual freedom. Martin Luther was the best exponent of it. It was followed by the demand for intellectual freedom. The scientific spirit with its amazing reconstructive energy is the best expression of that. It produced the demand for political freedom. The French Revolution and the American Revolution were clear and unmistakable expressions of that. Already the spirit of Democracy is recreating the political world. The latest expression of it is the demand for 'Social,' i.e. industrial, economic freedom. Socialism is one great expression of that. It was inevitable, and is prophetic of a great new day. It has profoundly influenced our conception of the gospel, and our view of the task of the Church in at least three particulars: First, it has made it clear that the religion of Jesus has to do primarily with the transformation of this present life, not with the prepara-

tion for another and totally different life. The field of our effort is the world—business—industrial, political, social, educational. The church is not a ferry-boat nor a fire insurance company. Its abiding prayer is 'Thy Kingdom come on earth.' Secondly, it has led us to put great faith in the law of growth as the method of the Kingdom. We trust not so much as our fathers to the startling, 'miraculous,' unforeseen, but to the steady, patient, diligent planting of ideas, ideals, inspirations, believing that our social order is the expression of our social spirit. Thirdly, we are just beginning to regain the sense of the value of the person as the instrument through whom the new order is to come. At this point we gather up the imperishable values of the gospel that our fathers proclaimed and relate them to the new great task by which we are confronted."

(9.) "I believe that the new social motive is sure to prove profound and permanent. It is not a substitute for the gospel, nor is it a new gospel, but it is a fresh and vital application of the gospel itself. For me it is a clue for understanding the Old Testament, especially the prophets, and for comprehending the message and the spirit of Jesus. I am sure the number of men for whom this is true is rapidly increasing. The social message colors all we have to say. It affects our theology and our ideals of practical church-work. Personally, I do not find that our congregations desire specific instruction on economic and social questions, and whatever my own interest, I do not find them suited for presentation from the pulpit save by way of illustration. Also I do not find that institutional work, or the enlistment of the members of our churches as such in special reforms or charities, is coming to displace the older type of church-work. I believe, instead, that it is the chief business of the Church to furnish the inspiration for the social task of religion, leaving the individual absolutely free to determine in what fields and in pursuance of what programs their service shall be rendered. Of course I recognize with profound appreciation the value of those institutional churches which have developed along the lines of the specific needs of their constituencies. The heroic effort which is put into many of these enterprises is deserving of all praise; but I am constrained to believe that most of our churches will serve the interests of the Kingdom of Christ best, not by becoming social centres, but by work more nearly along the lines of the traditional Church."

(10.) "First, the social movement has laid enormous emphasis on man's physical well-being, and thrust into the background the

more vital and fundamental issues that have to do with his spiritual well-being. It is remarkable how this age is interpreting religion in the terms of a materialistic humanitarianism. The churches have suffered much in spiritual redemptive power because of this new and one-sided emphasis. Secondly, this movement has tended to influence the Church to lose sight of the individual and to treat society as the organized unit with which it has to deal. The individual method of winning and saving souls has in large measure been abandoned, and we are afflicted with an endless number of general wholesale efforts to better mankind on the surface rather than in the mainsprings of the heart, where the seat of all evil lies. Christian effort has in consequence been much generalized and weakened, and not individualized, which is the Saviour's method of dealing with souls. Thirdly, that the Church has in large measure lost the redemptive fire cannot be doubted. Man's relations to God have become obscured because of the one-sided emphasis of his relation to man. We are creating an imposing superstructure of humanitarian love and neglecting the foundation of Christ's love upon which it should be built."

(11.) "The social movement is a fruit of Christianity and its growth, a sign of progress in the Church and the world. The social motive is coming continually to larger recognition in our churches, as is indicated by the very large proportion of church members among so-called social workers. I regret the disposition in some quarters to make social service the whole of religion; to omit from Micah 6 8 the 'walk with God,' which affords both light and inspiration for walking with men in justice and mercy. Religion has its root in personal relations with God. It is essentially individual. It means the welcome of God into heart and life as Sovereign and Friend. But His companionship works transformation into His spirit, and 'the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace,' and the rest—the social fruitage hanging thick upon the bough. Humanitarianism has but shallow roots. Morley's testimony is significant: 'We have all been upon the wrong track, and the result is that the whole of us have less to show for our work than that one man, Booth. Herbert Spencer, Matthew Arnold, Frederick Harrison, and the rest of us who have spent our lives in endeavoring to dispel superstition and to bring in a new era, have to admit that Booth has had more direct effect upon this generation than all of us put together. He has evoked the potent sentiment of brotherhood.' The gospel concerning man is inseparable from the gospel concerning God. Man is the child of God and the sacrifice of Christ the measure of

man's worth. And in that teaching lies the only adequate inspiration for human service. Apart from that teaching, we are likely to be satisfied with making men comfortable, while leaving their deepest needs unmet. Feeding, housing, and a fair wage are imperative demands to which the Church must not be deaf. But man's deepest need can be met only as men are brought, one by one, into harmony with the will of God."

(12.) "I am still enough of an individualist to believe that the dynamic for new life comes from getting the soul into right relations with the Supreme. Single tax and better housing and the abolition of child labor will not perform a magic and transform the earth into heaven. Neither are they all that the individual man needs. I side with Kipling, that 'the sin they do by two and two they must pay for one by one.' Each man must get right with God. The social movement as an interpretation and application of the meaning of the gospel is something that must never be lost by the Church until the need for social improvement is over; but if the social interest supplants the interest in the saving of the individual, it will be disastrous to the Church. The primary duty of the Church is to give spiritual food to the souls of men. I take this position after many years of study of social movements, and not a little activity in some forms of social service. The Church is not complete without both the social passion and the old passion for souls. The social passion is simply the interest that Christian people ought to take in the life of the rest of the world; it is the Golden Rule and the second Great Commandment brought out of the rear rank and put into the fighting line. The effect of it, when properly balanced by the other great passion—the passion for saving individuals—is to make the Church more efficient for doing Christ's work. Personally, I should not be happy if I were not engaged in some form of social work; but the condition in my own community well illustrates how the specific form and amount of the Church's activity is modified by what the rest of the community is doing. When we tried to have industrial classes and such things, we found that settlements, industrial schools, and similar efforts already under way made that form of activity for the most part unnecessary by us. The Church could best help there by co-operation. But the Church is sorely needed in the community to do the specifically spiritual work. The activities of any church should be guided by the community-needs; but for the most part, I believe, the Church will do best to inspire social activities, and to lay its own emphasis upon spiritual work."

(13.) "It seems to me that it is the new social emphasis which is thoroughly responsible for the present-day revival in religion, and I believe that the reaction of such an emphasis is very favorably evident in the churches themselves. It seems to me entirely healthy that people should no longer ask, 'What must I do to be saved,' but, 'What can I do to help save somebody else?' So far as my own experience goes, I feel that the new point of view makes churches less self-centred, and makes the Christian himself much more efficient, and therefore much more Christian. I do not see how the social motive can prove anything but profound and permanent, because it is being woven so completely into all the texture of our religious life; it certainly is the gospel, to my way of thinking, though of course not the gospel by itself. I do not think that we can ever forget or entirely overlook the individual emphasis. It wouldn't be human nature to do so. In the churches that I have had the good fortune to be associated with, the two go very essentially hand in hand; in fact, are about as inseparable as the right hand and the left, and about as necessary for a complete and well-developed life. The church I now serve is one that I suppose would be called an old-fashioned church; and yet I find that the social leaven has very thoroughly got into it, and, in my judgment, is making it a better church and more Christ-like than it ever was."

(14.) "You ask what in general is the result of the social movement upon the churches? I believe the result is to broaden the ethical message of the pulpit, until it tends more to touch all life and especially to convince the individual that he must carry his Christianity into his impersonal human relations as well as into his personal relations. Then I believe it is broadening greatly the work of the Church itself by teaching it that whatever is good for humanity is a legitimate work for the Church to undertake. As an illustration: If it is a part of the Church's work to console the mourning, it is also a part of its work to save children from dying and thus save people from the necessity of mourning. This illustration could be multiplied by scores. In the third place, I believe it is the broad ground upon which the churches are being and will be drawn into some sort of a working unity. So long as we discuss our intellectual differences, we shall tend toward more dense individualism and an atomic type of organization; but in the measure that we strive to work together we shall sink opinions and personal notions in the one motive of helping the world."

(15.) "I rather believe that the ministers have been quicker to

respond to the social movement than the average layman in the churches, but that, on the whole, while much is yet to be accomplished, the social duty of the Church is much more strongly felt than a few years ago. As might be expected, it has found expression in humanitarian and charitable work rather than in the broader conception of Christianizing the social order. There are a good many who very cheerfully accept responsibility for charity who are inclined to oppose changes in the social order which would make charity less necessary. To use the old expression, there are many who are much more interested in furnishing an ambulance than in building a fence about the precipice. It is easy to call social changes Socialism; but I believe the time is coming when the leaven will work still further, and the churches will see the necessity of treating causes rather than ameliorating consequences. But just this last thing: I do not think that the churches will grow away from the conviction of the profound social influence of personal righteousness."

(16.) "The perilous part of the whole situation lies in the law of antithesis. Just as it was faith over against works in the New Testament and has been asceticism over against almost Epicureanism in many quarters since, free will over against predestination, etc., so the difficulty is for the Church to do her whole duty to the social movement and yet to keep a perfect poise, and to remain true to her great function, namely, the implanting and cultivation of the spiritual life. As human nature is, it is hardly to be expected that any particular church, local or denominational, or the Church as a whole, will keep a perfect poise. Therefore one should exercise charitable judgment and should see the whole subject by and large. Now on the credit side for the social movement, it is to be said first of all, that the Church has largely originated it, has inspired it, and has wonderfully nourished it. Chalmers in Scotland; Maurice, Kingsley, Hughes in England; Beecher, Brooks, Gladden, and a multitude of others, stand out in the forefront herein. Moreover the great army of social workers is mainly nearer or more remotely of church lineage. This not only shows how powerfully the Church has accelerated the movement but also suggests the tremendous reaction of all this, and a favorable reaction, on the Church itself. Finally, there can be no sort of doubt that the Church makes a huge mistake if it undertakes mainly to conduct and to constitute the social movement. The social movement is for all people to get into, just as agriculture and manufacture are for citizens to undertake; and as the government should not undertake the bulk of

agriculture and manufacture, so the Church should not undertake the bulk of the social movement. It should be friendly and intelligent toward it. It should encourage and inspire it. It should perform part of the actual service. But that is not the Church's chief business. It is not to leave the Word of God and serve tables. Therefore all honor to those churches and to that spirit in the churches which puts first things first—Christ, His salvation, bringing men to Christ, deepening the spiritual life, comforting and inspiring God's people, and sending them out aflame to serve men both individually and socially. And comprehensively speaking, the supreme reaction of the social movement on the Church has been, partly by the inevitable lack of poise thus far, to set the Church thinking, to cause it to discriminate, and to deepen in its great leaders and in its general temper the purpose to magnify its own true function while inspiring and doing its share in the other functions."

The foregoing quotations fairly represent the judgment not only of the hundreds of clergymen who responded by letter to the questions propounded to them, but scores of others, clergymen and laymen, who were interviewed personally. The general judgment is that the social motive is profound and permanent, that it is the gospel though not all of the gospel, and that its effect upon the churches has been to harmonize and broaden them.

Life may be compared to an ellipse with two foci. One focus may represent the individual; the other society. If the individual sees only himself, if life is egoistic, self-centred, and grossly individualistic, then the ellipse is at an end. It is a mark of childhood that it sees only itself. The period of storm and stress appears when the child is passing from a self-centred life to another centre, and becomes aware of others. The change from childhood to youth is like the change from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican theory of the universe. If, on the other hand, society says that the individual is nothing, or but a means to an end, a cog in the wheel, and the individual soul is lost in Nirvana, then again the ellipse is incomplete. In the full-orbed

life, the two foci come closer and closer together, until one can say, "For their sakes I sanctify myself."

There are but two kinds of people in the world—good and bad, children of light and children of darkness, those who render social Christian service and those who live and die to themselves alone. The judgment of Jesus as portrayed in Matt. 25 31–46 is a social judgment. This is distinctively the age of social problems in Church and State. The Church is the temple of God, the individual Christians are the living stones from which it is built. Christ is the foundation on which it rests. If the Church would become God's holy temple, its members must unite themselves ever more closely with Christ, who was "not an economist, not a reformer, but a revealer," and "his social teachings are a by-product of his religious teachings." The Church is a living organization in the unity of all who love the Lord Jesus Christ and belong to those of the "Way." The remark of Irenaeus—"Where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church; and where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God"—should be strictly true of the Church today.

The Church stands primarily for worship. It is the first instinct which it satisfies. Through its relation to the time, place, and method of its services, the Church represents worship. The Lord's Day is the day of worship and the day of the Church. The meeting-place of the Church is arranged for worship, prayer, and praise. It may have its parlors as aids to fellowship, its gymnasium and workshops as helps for the development of the physical nature, its libraries, reading-rooms, and educational classes for the culture of the mind; but the prevailing idea of the Church is worship. It is more and other than a social settlement. As it stands for worship, the Church is greater than its building, its services, its preacher, or any choir it may have. The

Church includes all of these but is more than these. A beautiful building, impressive services, earnest preaching, good singing—all these are means to the higher end; yet the Church is more than these. It is the inspired personalities of the men, women, and children who make the Church.

While the Church uses the Sabbath and is greater than the Sabbath and is not to be conditioned by the Sabbath, which was made for man and most truly for the religious man, for worship, the Church should boldly defend the Sabbath from desecration, for it is the day above all others, set apart for worship and rest. And yet the Church should make itself felt every day in the week. The very sacredness of the Sabbath reveals to us the sacredness of all time. Even so the service of the sanctuary ought to influence men all through the week. The Church should stand for worship every day, and the meeting-house should be open every day for worship and service. Thus it may reach those who cannot attend the services of the Sabbath. The Roman Catholic Church is wiser than the Protestant; for with a force of men competent to meet the demands, the Cathedral is open for worship every day and makes itself felt through the week, with open doors and burning altars. It were a good thing if the Protestant Churches everywhere should teach the lesson emphatically that they are not "Sunday buildings," full of light and warmth on Sunday, and cold, dark, and damp, with closed blinds and locked doors, a very tomb, the rest of the week. When the church-building is always open, inviting worshippers into its sacred enclosures, not only on the Sabbath but always, when the young and old, on their way to school and work, will go through the open door of the church, where God is wont to meet and bless His people, and there offer a word of gratitude and a word of prayer for help in the day's

duties, then the Church will have a power it never had before. If it restricts its worship to the Sabbath and limits itself to the ordinary pastorate, the Protestant Church cannot do its best work. The great progress and power of the Roman Catholic Church lies partly in the fact that it touches the life and all of the life and every moment of the life of so many of its adherents. It does this largely by the concentration and unity of its work, employing three men ordinarily in its ministry where the Protestant Church has one. The Church worships because it cannot help worshipping. "My soul thirsts for God and I am restless till I find Him." Worship also gives the worshippers an opportunity for testimony, for the Church is set apart to bear witness to the Truth. "Ye are my witnesses." It gives this opportunity through the sacraments, its creed, and all its services.

The purpose of the Church is also to express fellowship. Here a community of interest is aroused through a common faith and hope. Because we have one Lord and one faith, we should be brotherly, having a common fellowship. A member of the local church becomes a member of the Holy Catholic Church, whose membership is both in heaven and earth. This thought of our intimate connection with all the saints in heaven and earth, this "communion of the saints," is an inspiring thought.

A great change is no doubt going on in the social conditions of our country—the drift of the population into the cities and the large towns, the alienation of many of the wage-earners from the Church, the strife between employer and employed, capital and labor. We may deplore many of the changes; still they go on. Here and now is the opportunity of the Church. It must not stand in the way of social progress; otherwise it will be stranded. The Church must be in the van of every onward movement. We must adapt ourselves very

quickly to changed conditions. Too often the Church has never yielded anything until forced to do so, and so has lost the respect and confidence of those whom it should have helped. As Christ went among publicans and sinners, as He helped the woman taken in adultery, healed this and that disease, and drove out the unclean spirits, so must the Church go forth to save the world, even if it has to adopt new ways of approach. In many ways the Church has lost her leadership of the world's advance movements, because she has lost her hold on the simple, strong, manly teaching of Jesus. The Christ who went to the individual also had compassion on the multitude and fed them. The Church has a work to save the individual; it has a very important work in the renovation of society; the work is individual and social. She needs a "sense of the organic."

The battle of civic righteousness, good government, and political integrity is to be fought in the cities of our nations as the storm-centres. The realm of city politics must become of definite concern to all, and the Church and its ministry must feel responsibility for the ethical ordering of the city. Education, charity, the home, the neighborhood have been Christianized to a certain extent, but the distinctively Christian motive has hardly entered into politics, either national or international. Social service belongs to politics, and the men who go into city politics, into public office, must go with the same spirit that animates every true Christian missionary. The future of Christianity depends on its controlling the world and the politics of the world; and the Christian clergymen and laymen who refuse, neglect, or delay to bring their gifts to the altar, to go out to cleanse the Augean stables of party politics and purify the city by their leavening influence, are recreant to their highest duties. "We want," says Mr. Robert A. Woods, "a body of social Christian voters who will not be content with a

beautiful private life but will want a healthful, beautiful public life." As Christ sent out His people into the common street to heal the sick, to help the needy, to purify the city; as Pentecost sent out the praying saints to the number of one hundred and twenty into the common streets of the city; so Christ, who though rich became poor for our sakes, sends out His disciples still to lose themselves for others in order that they may find themselves again. The Church is not the controlling force in the city, because, while preparing men for the life to come, it has not inspired them to live the life that now is to the glory of God and the service of their fellows. While promising them mansions in the skies, it has not aroused them to the necessity of a Christian home on earth. While saving the soul from the fires of hell, it has not sent out saved men into the burning heat of business, social, and political life, to redeem all life to God.

The Christian motive has scarcely touched the Christian voters in their dealings with each other. Great as the social message of the gospel has been during the last twenty years, it has as yet not vitally affected the churches in relation to public, political, and industrial questions. Salvation is by fellowship, not by institutionalism. We must be saved or lost together. The modern concern of Christianity centres about the work of men and their collective life, and Christianity must concern itself with such problems as charity, education, work, democracy, capital and labor, and the world-wide relations of the people and nations. The trust and the Labor Union alike are socializing forces, and the Church must keep her hand on the lever. The institutional church has rendered the world a service in showing us that the real concern of the Christian Church is to realize the life of God in the lives of men. The institutional church marked the transition from the

old to the new era in church work. It was temporary and distracting, and the pioneer—Berkeley Temple in Boston—has passed into a moving-picture show. The Church is an institution, but the emphasis is not on its institutional features. It must be primarily a prophet, an inspirer, a guide, showing the Way. The Church must be inspirational, social, and Christ must loom large. Because religion is social the Church must be social. The Church must be a friendly society, a co-operative commonwealth, where friendship shall be dominant. It must have such a fraternity that it will impress all to remark, "Behold, how they love one another."

The Church is far from having purified the amusements of the community and has scarcely introduced the religious motive into education. It has made its appeal to individual editors and reporters, but has not yet made its influence strongly felt on the press. It cannot Christianize the press by publishing journals of its own, or by stopping subscriptions, but rather by building up a body of Christian editors. It has not yet developed a body of Christian customers at the shops and stores, who can themselves regulate the sweat-shops, the hours of closing, and the rate of wages. The Christian motive does not yet prevail in the councils of denominational leaders, when they plant churches without regard to others and substitute for good-will the spirit of pride and denominational ambition.

The effect upon the churches of the social message of the gospel has been good so far as it has gone. The Church and its ministry, like some business men, want large and quick returns, and when the expected returns do not materialize immediately, there is a revulsion or new experiment. When the social message of the gospel has been heralded for a century in the dark places of the earth and the Christian motive has invaded the councils of nations and sects, it will be time enough to

condemn the social emphasis if it has not succeeded. Certainly the old individualistic appeal has not produced a Christian society or state. I believe in a new and social revival, different from any revival that has preceded, a revival of civic righteousness. A certain kind of socialist says, "Let the better world come by economic law." The Christian socialists, like Maurice and Kingsley, say, "Let the better world come by law and grace." The one force works from without, the other from within. Both should co-operate. The social question is a religious question, and all religious men and influences should co-operate. The universal solvent for the social and economic problems of the day is love and good-will. The remedy for the present sad state of affairs must be a radical one. The only remedy for the inordinate lust of wealth, the transformation of men into mere "hands," the exploitation of the unskilled and ignorant by the selfish and designing, is first to seek the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. The worship of God alone can overthrow the worship of gold.

Better than the dreams of the past, a necessity to interpret the realities of the present, is the vision of the City Beautiful that is to come, when men and women of every race worship God in the beauty of holiness; "when there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free"; when each man is the equal and complement of every other man with the freest opportunity for self-expression and self-realization, and with every possible inducement to do the right; when the boys and girls may play with perfect safety, if not in the streets at least in their playgrounds, and the aged may lean on their staves with the happy children gathered about them, as they say, like St. John in the market-place, "Little children, love one another"; when the youth will have time to grow in grace and in knowledge, and not be ground under

the wheels of the modern Juggernaut before they have passed the storm and stress of early adolescence; when the strong men of action, the "captains of industry," will bear each other's burdens and "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God"; when all employers and employed, rich and poor, Gentile and Jew, foreigner and native, male and female, shall be one, working with God and with one another. New men, inspired from on high, will make new conditions. The confusion of tongues which pride and selfishness caused on the plains of Shinar is changed into harmony and peace at the Pentecost of love and good-will in the Holy City.

A problem as great as that of slavery confronts us. What forces are to rule in the cities of America? Will self-seeking, the inordinate love of pleasure, the worship of gold instead of God, miserliness, and extravagance rule? or will love and good-will, devotion to the good, the true and the beautiful, the spirit of social service, and the socialization of wealth (coined service), ability, and strength? Every city may yet be the "City Beautiful," if all its people will unite heartily to make it such. Every city can be what she wants to be, and have what she wants to have. "Be of good cheer, and let us play the men for our people and for the cities of our God" (2 Sam. 10 12). That is a social message, needed today in the cities of America and the nations of the world. The social Gospel has come to stay. It needs to be preached in the courts of Europe and the city-halls of America.

# BOOK REVIEWS

History of the Hebrews. Frank Knight Sanders. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1914. Pp. xiv, 367.

The worth of this book is guaranteed by the author's recognized standing in the field of Biblical literature. The volume seems to us in some regards the most significant book that Dr. Sanders has yet published. Its exact scope is well expressed by the title taken together with the sub-title: "History of the Hebrews; their political, social, and religious development and their contribution to world betterment." Its real aim and spirit and limitations are admirably set forth in the Foreword:

"This volume seeks to make clear the important place of the Hebrew people in the history of nations and to justify the selection of their history, as set forth in the Old Testament, as an introduction to the larger subject. . . . There seems to be a place for a compact, comprehensive outline of Biblical history and literature, simple enough in its expression and execution to hold the attention of the growing mind, and yet complete enough to meet the reasonable needs of any mind. . . . The supreme defect of the religious thinking of the average man or woman today is its narrowness. Every religiously minded person needs to be familiar with the whole Bible and with the Bible as a whole. This knowledge need not be reserved for ministers or scholars. It may be the possession of any thoughtful student of religion. The writer has aimed to produce a useful book. It does not profess to be a contribution to original scholarship. The only originality that is feasible in a work of this sort is that of method."

In this book Dr. Sanders has placed his broad scholarship at the service of the Church. It is a book for Bible teachers and students. It is an admirable history, interestingly developed, with a true sense of proportion and of religious values. The method of organizing the material into chapters, sub-divisions, and themes, reveals the view-point of the teacher and will delight teachers who use the book as a text for classes. The large print, the outstanding themes in full-faced type, the maps and charts, and the excellent workmanship of the book-maker, will all commend it to the teacher and the student of the Old Testament.

The book admirably realizes the author's aim, and will prove an immensely valuable contribution to religious education, in which field the author has already done distinguished service.

Auburn Theological Seminary. Herbert Alden Youtz.

Das Buch Jesaia. Bernhard Duhm. Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht. Göttingen. 1914. Pp. xxiv, 459. 9*m*.

The third edition of Duhm's Commentary on Isaiah does not differ materially from its predecessor; the few corrections and additions introduced do not affect its main positions. Duhm's wealth of grammatical, critical, and exegetical matter makes his commentary an indispensable aid in the study of the mass of writings that goes under the name of "the Book of Isaiah," and the volume offers abundant opportunity for the dissenting remarks that are to be expected in dealing with a modern expository work which covers a large period of ancient life.

Crawford H. Toy.

Harvard University.

Jewish Mysticism. J. Abelson, D.Litt. The Macmillan Co. 1913. Pp. x, 184. $1.00.

At a time when in every form of thought, belief, and expression the intuitive and the immediate seem to have carried the day, it is nothing but natural that Jewish scholars should endeavor to hold up for special emphasis the mystical elements of Judaism. During the previous century, similar attempts were made with regard to its rationalistic elements, and mysticism, then decried as a false and superstitious doctrine, was deprecated as an excrescence on the body of Judaism. The reverse contention, however, of the present-day writers, and of the author of this work especially, seems to be weak in one important point. Too much attention is given to the study of books, and too little to that of persons. For to show that certain sets of ideas, generally identified in the history of thought with mysticism, have found expression in Jewish literature, does not prove the existence of a genuine type of native Jewish mysticism, unless it can be equally shown, by a study of the personal records of the reputed Jewish mystics, that the acceptance of such ideas was the result of some kind of mystical experience. Mysticism, after all, cannot be identified with any definite system of thought or belief; it is rather descriptive of a certain attitude of mind. In itself, the idea of an immanent God, for instance, is not more mystical than that of a God transcendent, neither is a theory of emanation more mystical than a theory of creation. That in the history of religion we find that men of truly mystical experience showed a decided bent towards one set of doctrines rather than to another is indeed significant; but it is equally significant that whenever

in the course of time those ideas which we associate with mysticism found their way into the all-absorbing and indiscriminate body of orthodox belief, they failed to foster true mysticism. In later-day Judaism, to mention but one example, many Cabbalistic doctrines and practices filtered into the orthodox creed and ritual without, however, affecting, for aught we know, the religious outlook of its adherents. The distinction between the dealer and the artist is by no means restricted to art alone. In mysticism too he who merely deals in it is not necessarily a mystic.

In this small volume Dr. Abelson describes Jewish mysticism at certain high states of its being rather than in the process of its becoming. About one-half of the book is devoted to the earliest period. Beginning with a brief characterization of the Essenes, in whom Jewish mysticism for the first time found articulate expression, the author passes over to a more detailed discussion of the vague references recorded in the Talmudic writings as to the existence of some indistinguishable, esoteric sects within Palestinian Judaism at the beginning of the Christian Era. He reproduces some concrete examples of their mystical doctrines, which he compares with analogous views which have come down to us in the writings of the protagonists of Hellenistic Judaism. The fifth chapter of the book takes up the Sefer Yetzira, which, we may assume, the author has selected as the best example of the mystical literature of the Geonic period. Although the date of the authorship of the Sefer Yetzira is a moot point, some placing it even as far back as the second century, historically it belongs no doubt to the Geonic period, for it was not until then that we find any definite traces of its influence as a book in the mystic literature. In the last three chapters, the author briefly sketches the contents of the Zohar, a book which is a syncretism of the diverse elements of the thirteenth-century Cabbalah rather than a culmination thereof. It would have added considerably to the value of the book had the author dealt more fully with the Cabbalah, its development, its divergent tendencies, its relation to the rationalistic strain within the Judaism of the time on the one hand, and to the Talmudic traditional strain on the other. The book, however, contains an exceptionally lucid statement of certain well-selected phases of Jewish mysticism. Intended for popular reading, it has the chief merit of being exceedingly well written; and while by its nature it had to confine itself to generalizations, it is blameless on the whole of any dogmatic and unsustained assertions. I can recollect only one exception. In his attempt to prove that the phrase "*lishkat hashaim*" refers to some

mystic sect (pp. 21–22), the author seems to have overshot the mark. The phrase, as translated by the author himself, literally means "chamber of the silent (or secret) ones,", and is described in the Mishna (Shekalim V, 6) as a place in the temple where "fearers of sin secretly deposited their alms, from which members of the impoverished aristocracy secretly supported themselves." There is nothing in the terms "fearers of sin" and "secret" to justify the author's contention that they refer to some members of a mystic sect. The rabbinic interpretation of the scriptural verse, "a gift in secret pacifieth anger" (Prov. 21 14; Sota 5a, Baba Bathra 9 b), will sufficiently explain the application of the phrase "fearers of sin" to those who had been thus averse to make their donations in public. And as for the meaning of the term "secret" or "silent" by which the donors are called, it refers to a kind of secrecy that is akin to "anonymity" rather than to "mysticism."

H. A. Wolfson.

Harvard University.

Irenæus of Lugdunum, A Study of his Teaching. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, M.A., D.D. With a Foreword by H. B. Swete, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 1914. Pp. 367. 9*s*.

The importance of Irenæus of Lyons among early Christian writers can scarcely be exaggerated. The period of his activity as a writer (the last quarter of the 2nd century) in which Gnosticism had reached its zenith, the compass of the work that he produced in refutation of the heretical thought of his time, together with his marked ability, render him a conspicuous and important figure in the history of the early Church. His work, to quote from Professor Swete's foreword to the volume under review, "is a first effort to grapple on a large scale with the problems of the rising faith and to construct the outlines of a Christian theology. It is a storehouse of materials for the early history of the canon, the creed, and the episcopate." Irenæus' work was constructive in regard to the positive teachings of the Christian faith as well as a destructive attack on Gnostic teachings. This double attitude of his work renders it of inestimable value to the student of the Church in the early centuries.

The plan of Dr. Hitchcock's book is at once simple and natural. The opening chapter gives a sketch of the life of Irenæus, as far as his life can be constructed from the comparatively few facts that are known of him. In this part of his work the author has made

no new contribution to our knowledge. The second chapter deals with the teachers of Irenæus, and of these Justin Martyr is found to be the most important and influential. A chapter is then taken up with an account of Irenæus' *magnum opus*—the *Treatise against Heresies*. In this chapter there is a scholarly and painstaking discussion of the work, its place in history, the extant Latin translations, and an indication as to where these may be found. In the chapter on the purpose of human life, much is made of the fact that for him life is regarded as an opportunity for education and not merely as a probation. In this education, not only the fall but even sin itself may be of value. Thus the view-point of the second-century bishop on this matter was thoroughly modern as well as thoroughly sane and practical.

In his estimate of the doctrine of the Trinity as found in Irenæus the writer differs somewhat from Harnack's conclusions, particularly in reference to the eternity of the Son and Holy Spirit. "Irenæus' doctrine," says our author, "may be summed up as a belief in One and the Same God, manifested to men in a threefold Personality, absolute, eternal, co-ordinated essentially as touching the Divine nature, but admitting of historical subordination as touching the Divine office" (p. 125). "He does not contemplate a time when either was not, nor does he hesitate to regard either as Divine" (p. 123). From this treatment of the Trinity the writer naturally passes to a consideration of Irenæus' treatment of "the Incarnate Word." While Irenæus did not have to deal with Arian tendencies of thought regarding the eternity of the Son of God, yet he appears to have taken for granted that He was, according to scriptural teaching, "begotten of the Father before all worlds." Whether this position includes that of absolute eternity is a debatable question. But apart from this historical question, which was scarcely raised in Irenæus' time, it is clearly shown that for him the Incarnation was a central truth. "With Irenæus . . . the religion of the Incarnation was not a mere adherence to a rational idea; it was faith in a Divine Person as well; it was not solely a *modus vivendi* between Christian doctrine and philosophy, but it was also the motive and inspiration of life; it was less the argument of a Divine thought than the influence of a Divine power, and so was a religion rather than a gnosis. We therefore give him no less than his due when we acknowledge that he was not only the first of the great ecclesiastical writers who assigned its due significance to the Person of Christ, but also the first who made his Christology the centre of a systematic cosmology, anthropology, and theology" (p. 128).

Further, in discussing the teaching of Irenæus on the Incarnation, the author offers some simple comparisons between his attitude and that of Ritschl on the Person of Christ (pp. 134, 148). He finds some real inconsistencies in the teachings of Irenæus, but stands firmly by the fact that he clearly grasped the purposes of the Incarnation. "The Incarnation is represented by Irenæus as fulfilling two supreme purposes with regard to the Father: (1) the revelation of His character and love to man, and (2) the realization of His original purpose in the creation of the race by the restoration of man to His image and likeness in the Son, which is incorruption and immortal life and sonship in the Father" (pp. 155–6). It might have added somewhat to the clarity of the author's meaning in this chapter, had he added a paragraph summarizing what he has so carefully worked out at considerable length.

In regard to the Atonement, "Irenæus proceeds to show that the human life of the Incarnate Word, consummated by the crucifixion, confers salvation, freedom, and divinity upon man. The work of the Atonement is identified more or less with the progress and process of His incarnate life. Every act of that life is regarded as of saving value, and the whole life as a work of salvation. . . . The Crucifixion marked for him the consummation of the Incarnation; but he did not restrict the work of the Atonement to the one transcendent experience in the incarnate life" (p. 159). The chapter also makes a careful comparison of the teaching of Irenæus regarding the Atonement with that of Tertullian (a propitiation and satisfaction made to God), and with that of Origen (a compensation paid to the devil). Over against this latter theory our author finely sums up what he considers to be the theory of Irenæus: "The debt which was owed, but which Christ did not owe, was to the eternal law of holiness; and therefore our redemption was effected by persuasion (*secundum suadelam*), not by force (*cum vi*); the captives of sin being drawn out of its sphere and power by the spiritual attraction of the Christ, the incarnate Word" (pp. 168–9). So he dismisses all thought that Irenæus agreed with Origen, but is not so sure that he may not have had sympathy with Anselm's "Satisfaction" theory. But, "he does not indeed insist on either compensation or satisfaction in the usually applied sense. . . . By the Son's obedience the law of holiness was fulfilled. It was to the law that compensation was given and satisfaction made" (p. 173).

Chapter XIV, on the Ministry, discusses the contentious question of the relation of the bishop to the presbyter in the early Church. The author thus states the position of Irenæus: "His use of the word

'presbyter,' however, is broad and was intended to apply to bishops as well as priests. For while he regarded every bishop as a presbyter, it cannot be shown that he looked on every presbyter as a bishop" (pp. 255–6). He notes the error made by Irenæus in saying (*Hær.* III, xiv. 2) that St. Paul at Miletus called together the bishops *and* presbyters of Ephesus *and the neighboring churches*, and concludes by showing that "Irenæus did not regard Apostolic succession as the title-deed of an exclusive hierarchy, but as the safeguard of the Scriptures and of the Christian faith and ministry" (p. 262). In the ministerial system as it was understood by Irenæus there was nothing "mechanical or sacerdotal." The discussion on the two sacraments (Chap. xv) is short and to the point. Of Baptism the teaching of Irenæus is thus explicitly summarized: "He regarded it as a rite to be administered to infants, who, as well as adults, are therein reborn unto God, and as a means of grace conveying regeneration, or a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness" (p. 267). As to the Eucharist, the author finds the source of Irenæus teaching in Justin Martyr's *Apologia* (C. 65, 66). "Irenæus did not speak of any physical change in the elements, or conceive Christ as present in any corporeal manner in the Eucharist" (p. 277). In pages 278–81 the order of the administration of the Communion in the days of Irenæus is clearly portrayed. Of Salvation the author says, "Salvation in this system included the full realization of all that God intended man to become in body, soul, and spirit" (p. 316). If this is so, how truly does the best thought of the twentieth century echo that of the second-century bishop!

As a conclusion the author attempts to reconstruct the beliefs of Irenæus into a creed. The attempt is certainly well made and of peculiar interest. The creed as stated by Dr. Hitchcock is remarkably Nicene in form and expression. Attention is called to the fact that the word "homoousios," "which figures so prominently in the Nicene Creed, was frequently used by Irenæus" (p. 342). A scholarly footnote shows the sources in the writings of Irenæus from which each clause of this reconstructed creed has been derived. It is no small tribute to the worth of this early Bishop of Lyons that Dr. Hitchcock can close his scholarly examination with the declaration, "He ever strove for unity in the Church and uniformity in doctrine and organization; and his mind and temper were of the sort that reconciles." The mind of the author seems to be cast in the same broad, irenical mould as was that of the early bishop.

A valuable *Excursus* on the Latin Translation of Irenæus closes the volume. The ample footnotes throughout will be an invaluable

help to every student who desires to master the teaching and thought of this early apologist. A full bibliography of the secondary material used by the writer will also be found useful. A carefully prepared, analytical index forms the conclusion of a volume that has been written by an accurate scholar for scholarly readers.

Oswald W. Howard.

Quebec, Canada.

Basil the Great. A Study in Monasticism. W. K. Lowther Clarke. Cambridge University Press. 1913. Pp. xii, 176. 7*s*. 6*d*.

It has been all too customary to speak of the Church in the East either in vague terms or in sweeping generalities. We have had little careful modern study of the history and institutions of that important part of Christendom. It has been a *terra incognita*, except to a few enthusiasts, and the real conditions have remained unknown even to many of them. Except in doctrinal matters, yet in them only to a limited extent and in quite conventional lines, there is little in English of much value on that part of the Church. Even German scholarship has had little interest in the subject. In spite of the difficulties connected with the study of ecclesiastical affairs in the East, the outlook for a more satisfactory study of Oriental Christianity is improving. The present work may be regarded as one more evidence of a rising interest; and it is a welcome addition to our limited stock of works on monasticism of a scholarly character, even if it touches at many points matters discussed by E. F. Morrison in his *St. Basil and his Rule* (Oxford, 1912).

The present work, although brief, is a piece of scholarly investigation, with the results presented in a compact and lucid manner. Mr. Clarke, an Anglican clergyman, writes with sympathy for the ascetic life in the Church, at least as expressed in St. Basil's Rules, appreciating the elements in the religious life that make for asceticism and recognizing its place in the work of the Church. Here the author appears to some extent as a follower of Harnack, who has done so much to rehabilitate monasticism among Protestant students of history.

The aim of the book is to present the main features of the Rules of St. Basil in their historical setting. Accordingly, there is given a brief study of the monasticism in the century before Basil, and especially of the Rule of Pachomius. This study includes the experience of Basil himself and the conditions of the Church in Cappadocia.

All this is introductory to an examination of the ascetic writings of Basil with an appreciation of the ideals embodied in them. The conclusion is appropriately given to a statement of the influence of Basil's Rules upon monasticism in the East, and through the Rule of St. Benedict of Nursia upon the monastic life of the West. Mr. Clarke finds the advance made by Basil upon Pachomius, his only forerunner, to consist mainly in three points: a consistently and successfully carried-out cenobitism, in which Pachomius, in spite of his vast establishments at Tabennisi, failed; the close connection between monasticism and the Church, whereby the monks became the great support of the Church in the later Roman Empire; and the insistence upon works of mercy and benevolence, including schools, as a part of the monastic system. In this last particular we would add that Basil was far in advance of all monastic rules in the West for centuries. As a matter of fact, there is no monastic rule in the West before the thirteenth century that lays down the duty of maintaining a school in connection with a monastery. The author, in his brief sketch of monasticism in the East, corrects the popular impression that all Eastern monks are Basilians in any sense of the term that resembles the terms Franciscans, Dominicans, or Carthusians. There is strictly speaking no order of Basilian monks. The influence of the Rules upon later ascetic life in the East varied greatly in different places and at different times. Not a few of the ideals for which they stood have been quite lost. Yet Basil remains as the father of organized monachism in the East. It is hardly necessary to add that the whole work is strictly *quellenmässig*.

J. Cullen Ayer, Jr.

Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Can We Still Be Christians? Rudolf Eucken. Translated by Lucy Judge Gibson. The Macmillan Co. 1914. Pp. 218. $1.25.

The change that has come over the face of the world since this book appeared, even in its English dress, raises the question whether already it possesses more than historical significance. Nevertheless, the volume is an earnest attempt to solve world-problems that antedated the gigantic struggle and will outlast it. In the reconstruction of religious thought and of church organization, which wars and rumors of war may hinder but cannot permanently turn aside, Eucken's contribution deserves its place as that of one who has some real vision of the future.

In eight chapters of condensed but not obscure statement, the

author gives a survey of the nature and requirements of Christianity, of the resistance it encounters today from naturalistic and subjectivistic modes of thought, and of the reasons for retaining its essentials, largely modified to meet the changed intellectual temper of the times. Whether or not all readers alike will assent to the irreduceable minimum that he would keep, no reader can lay aside the book without feeling himself instructed as to the perplexities of a growing number of alert and thoughtful minds regarding the traditional teachings of the Christian churches, and finding much frank dealing with religious systems as they were in Germany and Western Europe just before the great cataclysm. The volume has the characteristic merits and defects of Eucken's style, rendered into excellent English. Its handling is of broad currents of opinion, rather than of clear-cut issues. Everywhere the outlines are large and luminous, although, as in the wall-paintings of Puvis de Chavannes, there is a lack of precise detail. Eucken constantly writes as if at antagonists whom he seeks to refute, but without naming them or referring to their works. In this way a good deal of saturated knowledge is expected of the reader, who does not always get the guidance he needs. Yet the substance of the book is straightforward, and repays an attentive reading. As a whole, it is an impressive piece of spiritual diagnosis.

Diagnosis being the essential preliminary to any lasting cure, men of every phase of belief would do well to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest what is here offered for the relief of their estate—the radicals, who would revolutionize things to the extent of discarding the Christian past, that they may see how deep-rooted its principles are in the nature of man and of all spiritual reality; and the conservatives, who would keep it forever the same, that they may realize how completely some of their doctrines (as the Incarnation, pages 29 ff.) are out of accord, not with superficial doubt only, but, what is far more serious, with the entire trend of modern thinking. It is because Eucken is a layman and a philosopher, not a churchman or a theologian, that his counsels are of weight. For forty years and over, he has been a teacher, dealing intimately with modern youth in their formative period. He is also free to lay bare his real opinions. He admits his inability, from his early life, notwithstanding his keen interest in religious problems, ever to come into sympathetic relations with the existing churches. This in itself is an indictment, not to be successfully disposed of by retorting that it is typical of German university professors. Recurring again and again in his thought and writings to questions of Christian

belief and organization, he resolved at last to utter himself fully on these matters, since the time seemed ripe for speaking out and age was coming on, with the night when no man can work.

Space is wanting in which to discuss Eucken's conception of Christianity, and his chapter on "What Resistance does Christianity encounter Today?" easily the most remarkable in the book. The chief reason offered for not rejecting Christianity is that, after all, we have nothing to put in its place. Beneath all surface currents of opposition to religion today, there is a strong and irresistible trend toward spiritual life, both in its more general manifestation and in the particular form of religion. The deepening of religious feeling in Europe as the war progresses confirms this. Eucken's statement of the positive claims of Christianity on the modern world is one to be read with uplift of heart. His application is made to the churches "with which we Germans and Western Europeans generally are mainly concerned, viz. Catholicism and Protestantism." By Protestantism, he means principally the State Church of Germany. The chapter-heading, "The Impossibility of a Reform within the Existing Churches," states his conclusion, to which it is not a little significant that a thinker of Eucken's undoubted standing should have come. Nothing is said of Modernism in the Church of Rome, though the seeds of the future may be there. Conservative Lutheranism is held to be as alien to present needs as Catholicism. What calls itself Liberal Protestantism in Germany seems to our author lacking in force and resolution. He argues that there must be a new Christianity, root and branch. Here, where definite suggestion might be looked for, he fails us, being no prophet or religious genius. As is consistent with his professed "activism," he does not outline the coming doctrine or church order, doubtless thinking this may best be left to the working of vital tendencies that cannot be resisted.

The heart of the book is in the glowing statement on pages 124 ff. Whatever opposition religion encounters today, man must ever hark back to it for his spiritual self-preservation. The world which religion opens transcends nature and civilization alike, carrying with it a complete reversal of first impressions and sensuous values. The values of religion are absolute. It is not enough for Eucken, apparently, that religion shall be one element in a varied life, working harmoniously with its compeers, in democratic equality and mutual co-operation. Religion must have unquestioned supremacy. Nature, humanity, civilization, may stand around as obedient subjects in the imperial presence, but let them not dream of claiming

equality! Give religion this place of supremacy, and it will lift all life to a higher level. The effect of thus exalting religion to the highest place is not, however, as in the ancient and mediæval schemes, to set men wishing for a Beyond, but to lift human life into conscious and joyful participation in an "independent spiritual order, transcending alike the world and time," and conceived as revealing the ultimate depths of reality. The lack of definiteness in Eucken's setting forth of this leading concept is hard to excuse, as in the study of his larger works. The result of accepting the spiritual as supreme is a "complete reversal of valuation." In thus emphasizing religion as concerned primarily with values, Eucken ranges himself with the Ritschlians, and gives a handle to those critics who insist that his philosophy is incurably romantic.

One's doubts regarding this stimulating book are doubts that arise concerning Eucken's position in philosophy as a whole. His wavering and indistinct treatment of such controlling concepts as nature and humanity, and, above all, the "spiritual life"; his lack of concrete reference, making the checking of many statements impossible; his acknowledged irrationalism and mystical absolutism; force one who has been an admirer and who acknowledges a great debt to question whether his day is not already past, with that of Fichte and Hegel. A more relativistic and realistic type of thinking is coming to the front, which will be more specific in its routing of old ghosts from their places in the superstitious reverence of the multitude. Well will it be for this coming philosophy if it can stir conviction and arouse the impulse to action with as noble zeal and high fervor as did, in its long and stirring day, the absolutism of the great disciples of Kant, of whom Eucken is doubtless not the last and surely not the least.

Richard Wilson Boynton.

First Unitarian Church, Buffalo, N.Y.

Fated or Free. A Dialogue on Destiny. Preston William Slosson. Sherman, French, & Co. 1914. Pp. vi, 89.

This dialogue aims to be a fair presentation of the arguments in favor of and against free will. The sympathies of the author are evidently on the side of the indeterminist, who stands quite alone in the little drama against the professor of logic, the professor of physics, the professor of sociology, the Presbyterian minister, the novelist, the warden of the State penitentiary, and the man of practical affairs, all of whom proclaim the arguments of determinism

Of course, the denial of freedom which the physicist develops is very different from that of the minister and again from that of the criminologist, but all agree that freedom of the will is an impossible doctrine. Everyone of these opponents of free will—Professor Huxley Kohlenstoff, Dr. Clifford Denker, Rev. Edwards C. Gottlieb, Mr. Javerts Lawes, Mr. Meredith Riter—receives his eloquent reply from Mr. James B. Freeman the indeterminist. The questions which they try to settle begin with the naturalistic problem of whether there can be cause and effect if the will is free, and whether the reality of free will would affect natural science. Then they discuss the inner experience of freedom and the psychology of the will. From here they turn to the influence of heredity and environment. The following question refers to the practical importance of the belief in free will. Finally we stand before the religious inquiry: Can God rule if man is free?

The author does not claim to discuss the great question with the fulness it deserves or any special originality in the arguments on either side. But it may be acknowledged that he presents more or less familiar arguments in a lucid and interesting form. The irony of the book, however, lies in the fact that the objections to free will are far better presented than the case for freedom, which is evidently the side on which the author himself wishes to take his stand. The book makes us believe that James B. Freeman has effectively answered the arguments of his opponents. No doubt, he has answered some and has swept aside some others by enthusiasm and an expression of faith in freedom, but he has probably convinced neither Mr. Kohlenstoff nor Mr. Gottlieb nor even Mr. Lawes.

Yet is that really the fault of the cause which he defends? It seems rather a hopeless undertaking to make a fight for freedom if the idea of freedom is taken in the narrow and unsatisfactory sense in which the author proclaims it. To him the free will is a kind of psychological energy which the organisms have acquired at a late stage of natural evolution. He says directly: "The indeterminism of today is a critical philosophy which would not have been possible before Darwin, and most of the arguments for it depend upon the progress in psychology during the past twenty-five years." Hence the whole discussion starts on both sides alike with the epistemological presupposition that reality as the natural scientist describes it to us is the only possible object of interest and perception the only form of experience. A freedom which is a break in the chain of causality in the midst of a causal world is certainly contrary to the presuppositions of thought itself. If we start to conceive our world of impres-

sions under the thought-form of causality, it would be contradictory to accept as a part of this world a process which is on principle without causes. If we want to reach the world of freedom we must certainly go back to the fundamental conditions of experience, and recognize that reality seen under the category of causality is not the only form of existence. We know our own will and the will of our neighbors primarily in an entirely different form. We know it not by perceiving it but by willing it. In an attitude of affirming and denying we are aware of a reality which is absolutely different from that of the objects of awareness, and we reach the will of others not by perceiving them but by acknowledging them, by agreeing or disagreeing with them. A world of will-relations opens itself, in which the objects of nature come in question only as material for the will, as means and as ends. This is the true world of our historical and our practical life. In this world of will-relations are lying our logical, ethical, æsthetic, and religious ideals and obligations. It is a world that is just as complete in itself as that which the scientist builds up by his conceptional reconstruction of the impressions. But it is a world which cannot possibly be brought under the categories of causality; and just because there is no meaning in asking for the causes of the will in such a teleological world, the will as part of this true world of historical existence is free. At various points the arguments of the determinists and of the indeterminist in Slosson's book hint at this true world of freedom. But they completely fail to see its fundamental meaning, and therefore remain on principle at a level of thought at which freedom is fundamentally a problem for the biological laboratory-student and not for the philosopher.

HUGO MÜNSTERBERG.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

BIOLOGY AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS. GEORGE H. PARKER. The Houghton Mifflin Co. 1914. Pp. xx, 130. $1.10.

This volume presents in book form the William Brewster Clark Memorial Lectures delivered at Amherst College in 1914, by the Professor of Zoölogy in Harvard University. The first chapter deals with the structure and function of the nervous system, concerning which Professor Parker is a leading American authority. The second chapter emphasizes the importance of internal secretions or hormones upon the nervous and other functions, supplementing the action of the nervous system and affecting the temperament of the individual. The third chapter summarizes the more important recent discoveries in heredity, and points out the bearing of these

upon the problems of race improvement; while in the last chapter the factors in organic evolution are discussed and certain important conclusions drawn.

The author finds himself in accord with the program of the eugenecists "so far as it is directed toward the complete elimination of reproduction in the irresponsible defective." The inheritance of acquired characteristics being excluded as a factor in social evolution, the latter is to be effected by better environment (especially educational environment) for the individual, and by limited eugenic selection. The conscious control of evolution therefore, according to Dr. Parker, involves the education of the cerebral cortex and the elimination of defective germ-plasm. However unexpected (in a course of lectures upon social evolution) may appear this association of nervous, glandular, and reproductive functions, the conclusions of the writer will seem sound and convincing so far as they are limited to the physical side of social life, i.e., to the sphere of mechanism. There are certain assertions, however, made by Dr. Parker which transgress the field of mechanism and which will appear to many readers uncritical.

Examples of such assertions are that "human personality is an almost impalpable product of the cerebral cortex"; "memory is a function of the nervous system"; "the activities of the cortex include all our conscious states"; "our most profound activities are of a purely materialistic nature." Although Dr. Parker does not state the philosophical view-point from which such assertions are made, there is no doubt that they transgress the bounds of sound mechanism, and they will suggest to many readers assumptions which have been long since philosophically discredited. As a whole, however, the book is characterized by scientific accuracy and cautiousness of conclusions, and forms a valuable addition to the literature dealing with the science of social control or "conscious evolution," notwithstanding the failure of the writer to suggest that the "conscious control" of evolution involves other factors than the purely physical or mechanistic.

Herbert V. Neal.

Tufts College.

The Unfolding Universe. Edgar L. Heermance. The Pilgrim Press. 1915. Pp. xxiv, 463. $1.50.

In an earnest and interesting manner Mr. Heermance has brought together a large number of scientific facts from the physical, biological, psychical, and spiritual fields in an attempt to prove the

existence of God by the use of the modern scientific method of investigation and inductive reasoning. From man's religious experience the author infers the existence of an objective "cosmic mind," which works through man's subconscious self in the regulation of organic, nervous, physical, social, psychical, and spiritual growth with purposeful activity. This cosmic mind is God, and the end to be attained "the perfection of the mind of the total human personality as a social unit." Perhaps the scientist would hardly go as far as Mr. Heermance in saying that "as the physical universe exists for the solar system, the solar system exists for our planet. Man would then become the central fact in the plan and purpose of the universe." Nevertheless, the modern preacher of every denomination should find in the pages of *The Unfolding Universe* many scientific facts in a new setting, many philosophical truths in a new light, and many valuable suggestions for new lines of thought.

FREDERIC PALMER, JR.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF FAITH. BERTRAM BREWSTER. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1913. Pp. 201. $1.20.

The author of this work maintains the position that the logical faculty or understanding has its legitimate place and function in life but does not cover the whole of life, and particularly is it inadequate to deal with the deeper experiences in the philosophic grasp of truth, the aesthetic appreciation of beauty, and the ethical and religious love of the good. The world of life is greater than the realm of rationalism. He endeavors to give us a philosophy of faith. Philosophy finds that there are psychological and social causes of faith. Instinct, impulse, and experience play their part in its creation. The grounds of faith are thus psychologically well established. It is the task of philosophy to criticise this faith, to modify it, to purify it, and to relate it to the whole content of religious experience and the ordered world. Considerable stress is laid on the voluntary nature of faith and the obligation to cherish it. With such a conception of his task the author discusses in successive chapters such ideas as truth, virtue, freedom, beauty, and the highest good. The book is a good type of the more thoughtful popular philosophical treatise, which makes it appeal to persons who have an intelligent interest in the greatest subjects of thought; and to such the book may be commended.

DANIEL EVANS.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS. CHARLES HENRY ROBINSON, D.D. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1915. Pp. xiv, 533. $2.50.

The first impression of this book and the impression that abides is that it undertakes what cannot be done. To crowd the story of foreign missions into a single volume, even of five hundred solid pages, is impossible. The author recognizes the difficulty and in the opening sentences of his preface disavows the purpose to attempt any such recital. Instead he will only venture upon an outline sketch which may set forth in correct perspective the fields that invite separate and particular study.

In spite of this modest disclaimer the book stands, both in its title and in its make-up, as a record of the origin and progress of the modern missionary enterprise, as tracing from the birth of the new evangelizing impulse the gradual appearance of missionary societies, great and small, "Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Protestant," their several locations and fields of work, their contacts with the manifold races and religions of the non-Christian world, their developing lines of activity and, last but not least, as furnishing some adequate portrayal of the adventures and achievements which have marked this pathway of human endeavor.

The scheme of the volume is simple and orderly. Seventeen of its twenty-four chapters (IV–XX) deal with so many great lands of the world from India to the Isles of the Pacific. Chapters XXI and XXII treat of missions to Moslems and to Jews, peoples who, while one in their religion, are yet of many races and of many lands. Chapter XXIII, dealing with missionary societies, is practically a list of names and years, valuable for reference, but needing Chapter XXIV on the Outlook in order that the volume may close with such uplift and inspiration as the theme and the author warrant us to expect. For Canon Robinson is admirably qualified to write effectively upon the missionary enterprise. His knowledge is wide and comprehensive; his sympathies are broad; his judgment notably discriminating; his temper fair; his outlook courageous and Christian. The first three chapters of the book reveal the quality of its author. The opening or introductory chapter contains a sober yet strong setting forth of the universality of Christianity, what makes it both in its intent and in its effect a missionary religion. Chapter II sketches briefly but with firm hand the various methods of work employed from Paul's day to this more complex present, with its medical and educational lines of approach and its department of women's work. Chapter III furnishes the link that binds the

modern missionary movement to the era of the Reformation. These earlier chapters, being less burdened with detail, are among the most readable portions of the book.

The fact is that from the body of the work the juice is well nigh squeezed out through the terrific compression required and the obligation the author seems to have felt to name all the forces at work in each land with the statistics that mark their outstanding dates, their numbers, and extent of influence. These data, gathered with infinite pains as they must have been, yet, as they have been drawn from many sources, are often so dissimilar in their terms and classification as to leave a confused impression on the mind of the reader, who closes one chapter only to find the experience repeated in another field.

If one is really to feel the force of the foreign missionary movement of the last century, he needs to see with some vividness the habits of life and thought in the missionary lands, the soil into which the missionary message has been cast; to note its different reception in these unlike situations; to watch the variety in approach and in method by which it gradually won its way, and the marvellous result whereby has appeared out of so dissimilar conditions the normal Christian character and type of life. Something of the bulk and irresistible lift of the missionary enterprise, as thus suggested, seems to be lost to sight in these close-packed chapters and paragraphs; we are in danger of not seeing the forest for the trees.

The lack is made all the more evident from the fact that here and there through the book the author pauses in his enumeration of places, societies, and statistics to sketch some missionary hero, to characterize an epoch, or to portray a striking situation. In these passages he is at his best; informing, judicious, and sympathetic; able to value aright and to depict with appreciation the significance of the event on which he dwells. The work of Alexander Duff in India (pp. 88–90), the romance of Uganda in Africa's missionary history (pp. 347–456), and the description of events leading to the conference of three religions in Japan (pp. 237–240), are examples of these most satisfying oases in the dry and hurried march of the history. The frank yet impartial discussion of the unfortunate controversies between the different schools of Roman Catholic missions in China (pp. 179–180); or the outspoken criticism of Roman Catholic missions in South America (pp. 409–412)—the more noteworthy in that Canon Robinson is editorial secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, which represents the High Church party of the Anglican com-

munion—the estimate of the worth of mass movements in India (p. 127), and the trenchant comment upon the folly of the independent missionary (p. 305), illustrate both the author's knowledge in the field of which he writes and his firm and sound judgment in appraising its phenomena.

The following paragraph, quoted from the closing page of the book, reveals the author's sanity of mind and breadth of spirit. It shows his genius for seeing the heart of the missionary enterprise and his comparative disregard for the external forms and procedures:

"For the successful prosecution of the missionary campaign character is of greater importance than method. Many a missionary whose intellectual and other qualifications have been small, has exerted what to onlookers has appeared to be a miraculous influence by the life which he has lived in a non-Christian land. Many a mission which has adopted physical methods of propagating Christianity which appear to be wholly inconsistent with the Spirit of Christ, has achieved spiritual results which other missions that have been conducted upon the most approved lines have failed to accomplish. In both instances the influence exerted by the personal character of the individual missionary has been so strong that the wisdom or unwisdom of the methods which he has adopted has become a matter of secondary importance. It is St. Paul's character even more than his missionary methods which the missionary of to-day needs to imitate and to make his own."

It was inevitable that a volume crowded with facts and figures, many of them comparatively unimportant, should contain inaccuracies. If the writer may judge from the pages dealing with matters with which he is particularly familiar, there are altogether a good many such slips. The American Board has no missions in South America (p. 484), and has never handed over any work in Ceylon to Singalese (p. 146); its work is altogether among Tamils. And its 322 ordained native preachers are not called missionaries (p. 484).

The volume appears as one in the series of the International Theological Library. It is therefore designed primarily for students, a work of learning and leadership for the thought of those who would survey missions as a whole and analyze their progress with scientific precision. This fact accounts, no doubt, for the method of treatment of the subject, and justifies much that would be questioned if the book were intended for the general reader. It is not planned to awaken an interest in foreign missions, or to provide the preacher with telling missionary incidents. It is not a popular treatment of a big subject. But it is a great book, worthy to stand with its

mates in the Theological Library, justifying the assignment of a volume to this theme, and presenting what is now, and we may believe for long will be, the most comprehensive and informing history of foreign missions in the English tongue; and this without forgetting Robson's translation of Warneck's *History of Protestant Missions*. One cannot read this History through, despite all its pages of mere chronology, without appreciating the vitality and the achievement of the missionary enterprise and without coming to honor the devotion, versatility, and heroism of its promoters.

WILLIAM E. STRONG.

A. B. C. F. M., BOSTON.